DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 340 520 RC 017 487

TITLE Rural Life in 65. Proceedings of the Conference of the American Country Life Association, Inc., National 4-H Club Center (39th, Washington, D.C., July 12-13, 1960).

INSTITUTION American Country Life Association, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

PUB DATE 60

NOTE 86p.

PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Historical Materials (060)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Agriculture; Community Characteristics; Conference Proceedings; Farmers; *Rural Areas; *Rural Education; *Rural Family; Rural Population

IDENTIFIERS *Farms; *Rural Culture

ABSTRACT

The theme of this conference was "Rural Life in '65'." This document describes the social conditions and cultural features of America's rural community in 1960's. The following papers were presented: (1) "Rural Education in '65" (Lois M. Clark); (2) "The Rural Church in 1965" (M. J. Taves); (3) "The Farm in 1965" (Paul C. Johnson); (4) "The Community in 1965" (Otto G. Hoiberg); (5) "The Rural Family in 1965" (Edward W. O'Rourke); and (6) "Rural Beliefs and Values in Country Life" (John M. Brewster). Also included are the minutes of the annual business meeting; the report of the association's agreement to admit foreign associates; the 1960 list of members; and a collateral report of five discussion groups addressing topics that were significant to the local community, such as the declining number of farms and corresponding increase in size of farm operations. (ALL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED340520

Rural Life In '65

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Proceedings of the Thirty-Ninth Conference

of the

American Country Life Association, Inc.

National 4-H Club Center

Washington, D.C.

July 12-13, 1960

2

RC017487

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS

1960 - 1961

(Date indicates when term expires.)

PRESIDENT — Lois M. Clark (1962), National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street Northwest, Washington 6, D.C.

VICE PRESIDENT — J. Carroll Bottum (1961), Purdue University, West Lafayette, Ind.

SECRETARY-TREASURER — Rev. E. W. Mueller (1962), National Lutheran Council, 327 South LaSalle Street, Chicago 4, Ill.

DIRECTORS — Joseph Ackerman (1963), Farm Foundation, 600 South Michigan, Chicago 5, Ill.

E. W. Aiton (1963) Federal Extension Service, Washington 25, D.C.

Elmaar Bakken 1961), Boy Scouts of America, New Brunswick, N.J.

Roy C. Buck (1962), Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa.

Lippert S. Ellis (1962), International Cooperation Administration, New York, N.Y.

Arthur Floyd (1963), Tuskegee Institute, Ala.

Rev. R. T. Frerichs (1962), American Baptist Convention, Rural Church Center, Green Lake, Wis.

Aubrey D. Gates (1961), American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago 10, Ill.

Edward F. Holter (1963), The National Grange, 1616 H Street Northwest, Washington 6, D.C.

Rev. Serge Hummon (1963), Congregational and Christian Churches, 19 South LaSalle Street, Chicago 3, Ill.

Gertrude Humphreys (1963), West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va.

Paul C. Johnson (1962), Prairie Farmer, 1230 Washington Blvd., Chicago 7, Ill.

S. Janice Kee (1961), Wisconsin Free Library Commission, State Capitol, Madison 2, Wis.

Ivan E. Parett (1963), Illinois Agricultural Association, 43 East Ohio Street, Chicago 11, Ill.

Mrs. Haven Smith (1961), American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago 54, Ill.

Maurice Soults (1963), Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.

J. K. Stern (1963), American Institute of Cooperation, 1616 H Street Northwest, Washington 6, D.C.

Milo K. Swanton (1962), Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperative, 205 Tenney Building, Madison 3, Wis.

Merle Thomas (1961), The Kroger Company, 1014 Vine Street, Cincinnati 1, Ohio.

W. J. Tudor (1962), Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Ill.

A. F. Wileden (1961), University of Wisconsin, Madison 6, Wis.

Rev. Irwin Will (1961), National Catholic Rural Life Conference, 514 East Lawrence Avenue, Springfield, Ill.

Rural Life In '65

Proceedings of the Thirty-Ninth Conference
of the
American Country Life Association, Inc.
National 4-H Club Center
Washington, D.C.
July 12-13, 1960

Printed by Miracle Printing Company
Berlin, Wisconsin

For The American Country Life Association, Inc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

RURAL EDUCATION IN '65, Lois M. Clark, Assistant Director of Rural Service, National Education Association 5

THE RURAL CHURCH IN 1965, M. J. Taves, University of Minnesota 15

THE FARM IN 1965, Paul C. Johnson, Editor, Prairie Farmer 28

THE COMMUNITY IN 1965, Otto G. Hoiberg, Head, Community Services, University Extension Division, University of Nebraska 33

THE RURAL FAMILY IN 1965, Rev. Edward W. O'Rourke, Executive Director, National Catholic Rural Life Conference 40

RURAL BELIEFS AND VALUES IN COUNTRY LIFE, John M. Brewster, Agricultural Economist, United States Department of Agricultural Research Service, Farm Economics Research Division 46

A COLLATERAL REPORT OF THE FIVE DISCUSSION GROUPS 55

CITATION TO MILBURN LINCOLN WILSON 62

CITATION TO HOWARD A. DAWSON 64

ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING 66

AMERICAN COUNTRY LIFE ASSOCIATION, INC., Treasurer's Report 67
(January 1, 1959 through December 31, 1959)

AMERICAN COUNTRY LIFE ASSOCIATION, INC., Treasurer's Report 68
(January 1, 1960 through June 30, 1960)

REPORT OF ACLA — AGREEMENT WITH ICA — July 11, 1960 69

BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING 70

MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN COUNTRY LIFE ASSOCIATION, INC. 79

RURAL EDUCATION IN '65

LOIS M. CLARK
Assistant Director of Rural Service
National Education Association

It is difficult to assume the role of prophet, especially if one is primarily a public school educator, as I am. Wishful thinking, and the hope that at long last we will bring our "doins" a little nearer to our "knowins" and beliefs, may easily lead to a too rosy optimism. For the American attitude toward education is somewhat paradoxical. As a people, we have believed from earliest times, as the framers of the Northwest Ordinance stated in 1787, that "schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." Yet in these days of the affluent society we give to the support of education a proportion of our resources much too small to keep our people abreast — or, hopefully, a bit ahead — of their educational needs.

Arthur P. Crabtree, writing on "A Case for Public School Education" in 1959, has a theory about this. He states:

> ". . . the lot of the American taxpayer is an unhappy one, at best, and school affairs represent one of the last arenas in public life where his voice can still be heard. He can appear at the school's budget hearing, make his speech, and cast his vote according to his own values. This privilege has been slowly whittled away in most other areas of government operation. Thus his accumulative resentment over the shrinkage of his political rights is sometimes expressed with a left uppercut to the chin of public education".[1]

Whether education is alone in having the high esteem of the public in principle but a too limited support in fact, I shall not attempt to say. Nor am I inclined to argue whether Mr. Crabtree's theory is fully supportable. Rather, let me turn back sixty years, before taking a forward look, and quote from the September 1910 **Report of the Commission on Country Life:**

> The subject of paramount importance in our correspondence and in the hearings is education. In every part of the United States there seems to be one mind, on the part of those capable of judging, on the necessity of redirecting rural schools . . . Everywhere there is a demand that education have relation to living, that the schools should express the daily life, and that in the rural districts they should educate by means of agriculture and country life subjects.[2]

Continuing, the Report states that schools "are held to be largely re-

1-Crabtree, Arthur P. "A Case for Public Education", **Adult Leadership,** November, 1959, p. 130.

2-**Report of the Commission on Country Life.** Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. May 1944 (Reprint) p. 121.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

sponsible for ineffective farming, lack of ideals, and the drift to town," not because the rural schools, as a whole, are declining but because "they are in a state of arrested development and have not yet put themselves in consonance with all the recently changed conditions of life." Hopefully, the Report predicts "that the farming population will willingly support better schools as soon as it is convinced that the schools will really be changed in such a way as to teach persons how to live."

It is not my intention to give here a review of the extent to which rural education has been redirected in the past fifty years. Rather, I ask you to look at the general climate in which rural education functions today.

Curiously, those of us who work in this field frequently face the necessity of reaffirming the importance — even at times the continuing existence — of rural education. Apparently misapprehension arises from facts from which unwarranted conclusions may too easily be drawn — the facts, for example, that proportionally fewer people now live on farms, and that differences between rural and urban living are diminishing. Clearly these facts must be balanced with the knowledge that the numbers of people living in non-farm rural areas and the numbers engaged in rural-related occupations, are growing, so that rural people continue to be a sizeable and significant group in American life. Furthermore, one need only range over the infinitely varied landscape of this country, looking about for what is significant in the day-to-day lives of people, to see that very real differences continue to exist between rural and urban life. M. L. Cushman has identified some significant distinctions between "rural" and "urban". He writes:

> "First, (in the rural community) there is a relatively low density of population. People just live farther apart than in cities, and communities simply are small. Secondly, most of the people in rural communities are primarily dependent for their livelihood upon the immediately surrounding resources and the uses made of them. These resources may be rich soil, lakes, minerals, or trees, but the inhabitants secure their living from them rather directly. When a population aggregate grows so large that the majority of the people make their living by the processing of raw materials brought in from distant places into manufactured goods . . ., people take on the social and economic characteristics usually associated with cities and the community is no longer rural".[3]

Another often-misinterpreted fact deals, not with the reality of rural life but with rural education as such. The one-teacher school — "little red-schoolhouse" of an earlier day — is rapidly giving way to a larger school. But great numbers of people — too many of them in the field of education — have in their thinking equated "rural education" with "one-teacher school". So, **ipso factor** when the one-teacher school passes, to their thinking, rural education ceases to exist.

[3]-M. L. Cushman, "The Reality of Rural Education", **Phi Delta Kappan**, XXVI, (October 1954) p. 4.

We find it necessary, therefore, to make clear what we mean by "rural education" as a special field. Its basis, as we see it, lies in large part in the environmental influences at work in rural communities — both farm and nonfarm. Because of these influences, rural people face unique problems and have distinct resources with which to work. The rural school, today, most likely is one that serves the entire rural community, including a hamlet, village or town center, and the surrounding open-country territory. Sometimes children from such communities receive part of their schooling — especially at the high school and junior college levels — in large towns or cities; since the needs of these children in part grow out of their experiences in rural living, these too, are a proper concern of rural education.

The changes in rural education which are easiest to see are those having to do with district reorganization and the development of larger attendance units, with the accompanying construction of new school centers and wider use of school buses. But these, though important, are the externals of an educational program. I should like to place them in their larger setting. For these changes in school organization, and others I shall mention, have come about in part in response to the challenge issued fifty years ago. In the years ahead, we face still greater challenge, for new elements have entered the picture. Let me present some of these elements by quoting from materials which some of the members of this conference have helped to develop.

At the October 1954 National Conference on Rural Education, which was sponsored by the National Education Association and participated in by a wide range of professional and lay persons, a sectional meeting undertook to identify some significant economic and social trends and to point out some of their implications for education. I cite selected items from the report of this group:[4]

POPULATION CHANGES —

Trend: ". . . within the farm population the rural nonfarm sector is growing rapidly while the rural farm population is declining. Many nonfarm people now live in the countryside."

Implications: "This suggests a re-examination of the rural school curriculum in terms of more varied vocational training as well as improved generalized education directed to developing behavior for a variety of environments . . . Necessitates a broader base for financial support to take care of population shifts."

OCCUPATIONAL CHANGES —

Trend: "A large sector of agriculture has become highly commercialized — agricultural technology has increased . . .: size of operations has grown in terms of capital, not alone in acres; the number and amount of business transactions of farmers have expanded greatly; and agricultural policy has become important in terms of adequate returns to the operator."

Implications: "Educational offerings for youth planning to enter agriculture

[4]Department of Rural Education, 1955 Yearbook. **Rural Education — A Forward Look,** Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1955, p. 53-62.

must be adapted to this change . . . Training in technical agriculture and farmer cooperation should be given in a much larger number of rural schools. The curriculum should be broadened to include more training in the business transactions of farm families. Adult education programs of schools and the Extension Service should be strengthened and should include public affairs as well as farm productions and living."

INCOME CHANGES —

Trend: "While there is a definite shift in agriculture to more economic units with higher incomes, there are still many low production, low income farms."

Implications: "These small, low income farmers constitute a group which have received little attention from public agencies. The rural schools are often inadequate in these areas. Educational leaders need to study and plan how to help these people to increase their farm income and to find supplemental employment."

CHANGING SOCIAL STRUCTURE AND PATTERNS —

Trend: ". . . numerous changes (are) occurring which involve shifts from small, personalized, intimate groups, to large, less personal groups . . . Social contacts are made over wider areas; the community is larger. Yet the family still continues to be the core of rural society."

Implications: "This means that we should make the most rational adjustments possible to these broad changes, including school district reorganization and curriculum, and not clock them by insisting on maintaining old forms and symbols which can no longer function. New school district boundaries should take into account as far as practicable 'natural community' areas which are taking shape."

It will be noted that the implications drawn from these, and other, trends identified by this Conference group call for offerings in keeping with the Country Life Commission's concern that "education have relation to living, that the schools should express the daily life." Because of the greater complexity of rural life today, the school's offerings must be broadened.

Another dimension of educational change also should be identified. This dimension is implicit in the analysis of farm policy making and its implications for education, made by John H. Davis in speaking to a general session of the 1954 Conference on Rural Education mentioned above. He said, in part:[5]

"Today our rural society is so complicated and intricate that no one person or organization can possess the competence to deal with all phases of it. Almost no problem in agriculture today is so simple that it is exclusively the interest and concern of one rural institution or organization. This being true, the only way to obtain the competence needed to solve a problem is to bring together selected individuals whose composite know-how covers all essential phases of rural life. Working together, such persons

[5]-Department of Rural Education, 1955 Yearbook. Op. cit., p. 230-231.

can find satisfactory answers to complicated rural issues, including the problems of rural education.

"With respect to many of the problems in agriculture, the best solution often is obscure – it must be searched for and developed. To a large extent this obscurity, itself, is a by-product of the rate of change in our rural society. Under such conditions the search for truth has to be a continuing process. Education has a responsibility – a great responsibility – to search for the truth and to disseminate it when it is known.

"In many situations today not only is the truth obscure, but also rural people must choose between alternative courses which are open to them. This means that there is a judgment to be exercised – a decision to be made. With respect to basic farm policy, education should develop true facts and disseminate them – leaving the task of choosing a solution to the farm leaders, government officials, legislators, and the electorate."

Continuing, Mr. Davis presents this view regarding the general role of education:

"The task confronting education is not just one of trying to meet the educational needs which exist today. Rather, it is one of developing an educational program which itself is geared to change – one which not only will meet the needs of today, but also of tomorrow, next year and ten, twenty, and even fifty years from now.

"Education, along with the home, church, and other institutions, must assume a heavy responsibility with respect to the use to which new discoveries and techniques will be put. While research and technology are powerful tools in the hands of men, of themselves they possess no sense of moral direction. They contain no inherent qualities to assure us that the changes they initiate will result in the evolution of a better world . . . Man, himself, must supply the social, moral and spiritual values which determine the way in which the fruits of technology will be used.

"The responsibilities of education are further increased by the fact that improvements in the educational system must take place 'on the march'. There is no such thing as stopping the motors of rural society until alterations can be made. Changes must take place while society is in motion. Also, the fact that we are forced to adapt our educational programs to a future which is different from the past means that we can never fully rely upon past experience as our guide. We constantly must be projecting our plans to make them fit a future which not only will be different, but, in many respects will be unpredictable."

Not long ago Margaret Mead posed a question that is appropriate here:

"Is it not possible that an educational system that was designed to teach what was known to little children and to a selected few young men may not fit a world in which the most important factors in everyone's life are

those things that are not yet, but soon will be known?"[6]

Dr. Mead was attempting a redefinition of education, for, she said, "when we look realistically at today's world and become aware of what the actual problems of learning are, our conception of education changes radically. Although the educational system remains basically unchanged, we are no longer dealing primarily with the **vertical** transmission of the tried and true by the old, mature and experienced pupil in the classroom. This was the system of education developed in a stable, slowly changing culture. **By itself,** vertical transmission of knowledge no longer adequately serves the purposes of education in a world of rapid change.

"What is needed and what we are already moving toward is the inclusion of another whole dimension of learning: the **lateral** transmission, to every sentient member of society, of what has just been discovered, invented, created, manufactured or marketed. This need . . . exists no less in the classroom and laboratory than it does on the assembly line with its working force of experienced and raw workmen. The man who teaches another individual the new mathematics or the use of a newly invented tool is not sharing knowledge he acquired years ago. He learned what was new yesterday, and his pupil must learn it today."

Dr. Mead concludes by saying: "We cannot accomplish the essential educational task merely by keeping children and young adults — whom we treat like children — in school longer. We can do it by creating an educational system in which all individuals will be assured of the secondary and higher education they want and can use any time throughout their entire lives."

To this point I have, in large part, spoken of rural education chiefly in terms of the schools. While schools — especially the public schools — are charged with a unique responsibility, theirs is but one part of a much broader undertaking. This fact was recognized by the Commission on Country Life, which stated that "the associations that have an educational purpose are very numerous," although many of them did not "accomplish a definite end" or maintain a continuous activity.[7]

John Davis also has something to say about where responsibility lies:

> "We must think of rural education as encompassing not only that learning which takes place in schools and colleges, but also as including the whole learning process in the rural community. A careful look at rural institutions will reveal that all of them perform educational functions of one type or another. Certainly the home and the church are important centers of learning. Actually, the same is true of the other institutions in varying degree . . .

[6]-Margaret Mead. "A Redefinition of Education". **NEA Journal,** October 1959, p. 15-17.

[7]-Report of the Commission on Country Life. Op. cit. p. 129-130.

"The educational function of these other institutions encroaches in no serious way upon the role of formal education. The total field of learning is so vast in comparison with existing educational facilities that our concern should be over what is being left undone rather than over who should do it. Where harmony exists, the educational activities of the other groups actually increase the job to be done by the schools by whetting people's appetite for knowledge. In addition, where proper teamwork exists, the other organizations engaged in education will place increased responsibility on the schools by requesting help in research and in the planning of their programs. The rural school should be the center not only of formal instruction, but also of educational services for the whole community."

Among the institutions whose programs are becoming increasingly significant in rural communities is the public library. Fifty years ago, the Country Life Commission referred to the rural library as "one of the most promising" of the newer agencies then extending their work to the open country. Over the years, library service to rural areas has grown. Yet in 1956, just prior to the enactment of the Library Services Act, a survey of rural areas under 10,000 population, made by the Library Services Branch of the U.S. Office of Education, revealed:

26 million people without any public library service in rural areas;

50 million more with inadequate library service as measured by state standards;

319 rural counties without any public library within their borders.

The Library Services Act, authorizing the appropriation of $7.5 million a year for five years, was passed by Congress and signed by the President in June, 1956. On July 31, 1956, an appropriation bill provided $2,050,000 for the first year. The following years, appropriations of $5 and $6 million were voted. At the end of June, 1959, John G. Lorenz, director of the Library Services Branch, could write:

Thirty million rural people now have new or improved public library services available to them as a result of this cooperative state-local-federal program.

County and regional library developments have brought public library service for the first time to over one million rural children and adults and substantially improved service to 7.6 million more.

State appropriations for public library services to rural areas have increased 54 percent since 1956.

Local appropriations for public libraries in rural areas under state plans have increased 45 percent since state and federal funds were available for stimulation and development.

Approximately two hundred new bookmobiles are travelling rural roads, bringing books and information to people in remote areas.

[8]-Lorenz, John G. "Library Services Act — the first three years". **ALA Bulletin,** January 1960, p. 18.

RURAL LIFE IN '65

I turn now to the specific question I am asked to answer: What will rural education be like in 1965?

I believe certain directions in which we are moving are clearly marked; the question is, how far in these directions will we have moved? Surely we will have made considerable progress in working together as organizations and institutions with common concerns and related responsibilities. As for the schools, we may expect that:

- The school-age population in rural areas will have increased, with the increase occurring in nonfarm areas. Provision for increasing enrollments will be a major problem by '65 in rural as well as urban areas.

- The number of one-teacher schools will continue to decline; by '65 there will be only 10,000 such schools.

- The number of high schools with less than 100 pupils will continue to decline; by '65 they should reach 2,000. Beyond this point further decline will be difficult or impossible unless technological advances bring other factors into play. While the schools under 100 decline, those between 100 and 300 will continue to increase. (In this connection it is appropriate to note Conant's recommendations as to the minimum high school enrollment for which a comprehensive program can be offered efficiently.[9]

- Many rural school districts will have moved on to the ten-month term. (The nine-month term is now a reality for most all such districts.)

- The training gaps between urban and rural teachers will close, especially in the secondary schools. By '65 the rural teacher should meet accepted qualification standards and be almost as well prepared professionally as her urban counterpart.

- The salary gap will very likely continue and may very well grow larger. Although the salary of the rural teacher will increase, the increases will probably not keep pace with those granted to urban teachers.

- As the salary gap is perpetuated and increased, the problem of teacher shortage will become greater for the rural area in relation to the urban. In a situation where there is short supply of teachers the rural school will be hard pressed to fill its needs if it must pay inferior salaries.

- The per-pupil cost of education in rural areas should have declined, since the ratio of pupils per teacher should increase due to reorganization and growth in school size.

- The move toward larger community-school districts will continue.

- As effort is made to extend the concept of equal and adequate educational

[9] Conant, James B. **The American High School Today.** McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959. 140 p. (paper).

opportunity to all citizens, intermediate administrative units at county or area levels will provide services which cannot be efficiently or effectively provided by local districts.

- The principle of federal responsibility to assist states and local communities in providing the quality of education needed will have been accepted. This fact, together with the efforts of other agencies and organizations, will make it possible to improve significantly the educational status of persons in economically disadvantaged areas of rural America.

- Efforts to discover, devise and adapt methods and procedures to the special problems of those small high schools which must of necessity remain small will have expanded, and some good pilot programs will be in opperation.

- Inservice education — through college and university workshops, field service programs, etc. — and the leadership of local and intermediate administrative offices and professional organizations, will have helped many teachers to up-date their subject matter knowledge and improve their teaching procedures.

Other aspects of anticipated growth could be mentioned, but time and space prevent. Let me finish by suggesting that **the teacher is still the most significant single element in a good teaching-learning situation.** Let me further remind all of us that effective teaching requires that the teacher understand, and be able to take into account in the day-to-day work of the classroom, at least three factors:

- **The child as he is** — a maturing human being who learns and develops in accordance with fundamental principles which research and study are helping us to understand better.

- **The society in which the school operates and the child lives** as it influences both long-time and immediate goals of education and affects the availability of significant cultural resources and conditions for wholesome growth.

- **The individual school and the school system** within which the time, facilities and resources for learning are organized and services needed to facilitate for learning and teaching are provided.

Finally, because it touches on values, let me express a hope. It is that, as we move from the school located within walking distance to the larger district with its cluster of schools and its system of school bus transportation, we can and will preserve — and, it may be, strengthen — certain positive values which seem to be inherent in rural education at its best. Francis Drag posed the question we face in these words: "How can we discover the uniqueness in rural life that can be exploited by education in developing citizens with the competencies needed for democratic living in the present-day culture?" Exploring this question, Mr. Drag stated:

"We have come to feel that the strength and the worth in rural education lies somewhere within the whole wide area of how people can live better together – the whole area of human relationships. Is there not to be found in the rural environment a peculiar and happy combination of relationships of soil to people and space and time which somehow sets the stage for the kinds of human relationships which are essential to the good life? When we have discovered this, this uniqueness of rural life and its contribution to be made, then it would seem to me we have, and would have only then, a sound approach to the innumerable problems which plague us from day to day as we work in rural education".[10]

10-Department of Rural Education, 1955 Yearbook. Op. cit., p. 65.

THE RURAL CHURCH IN 1965

M. J. TAVES
University of Minnesota

A recognition of the primary role which the church has played in the development of rural America and its potential for helping guide rural America toward an even greater future makes it a real challenge to address myself to the topic assigned: The Rural Church in 1965.

Although as a social scientist I should like to lay a claim to insight and foresight sufficient to predict where the rural church will be in 1965 and what it will be doing, such is possible only in a very general way. Predictions so made would be contingent upon the assumption that recent trends will continue for the next five years uninterrupted by any major catastrophe or unforeseen events on either the local, national or international scene. To the extent that these assumptions are correct, scientist's predictions tend to be correct. In viewing the future we are still greatly dependent upon the proverbial crystal ball.

I rather doubt that I have been asked to deal with this topic today because my crystal ball is any better than yours; in fact, I dare say, in many ways it may not be as clear, for some of you are more intimately associated with the rural church than I. I would rather presume that I was called upon because my crystal ball might present a perspective somewhat different from some of the others here. In that way a combination of the image you receive through your crystal ball and the one I receive through mine should provide a more realistic impression of where the rural church might be, where we should like it to be, and how best to insure its potential development between now and then.

Let us first of all dilineate our subject. We are to talk about the rural church. Both of them (rural and church) have different meanings in different times and for different people.

Rural —

Rural for over 100 years was defined by the U.S. Census as including all places up to 8,000 population; during the latter eighteen hundreds the figure was reduced to 4,000, and since 1910 the figure has stood at 2,500; all places larger are classified as urban. Also among the town and country departments of the various church groups, different figures are being used. Since 1952 the Presbyterian U.S. Town and Country Department has been assigned responsibility for all communities up to 5,000 population; while the town and country departments of the Protestant Episcopal, Methodist and Presbyterian U.S.A. churches have responsibility for all communities up to 10,000; and if I remember correctly, the town and country department of the National Lutheran Council now has responsibility for all communities up to 25,000 population. As a sociologist, I would attempt to define rural to include all communities up to somewhere between 10 thousand and 25 thousand population, who are

outside the immediate environs of a metropolitan center. For purposes of our discussion today, this however, would be somewhat over-restrictive because one of the major areas of concern for town and country departments during the next five to ten years, if not longer, is going to center on the rapidly growing suburban communities surrounding our metropolitan areas.

The Rural Church —

It is generally agreed that churches have both a temporal and spiritual aspect. Our thinking will be focused exclusively upon the temporal **aspect,** or that which is generally referred to as "the church as a social institution". As such the church is looked upon as a social organization or social system, consisting of persons coordinating at least a segment of their activities in a predetermined pattern of cooperation designed to achieve certain objectives more efficiently or more completely than would be possible through individual action. As a social institution the church loses its function in a society — its importance to its membership — when it no longer provides a more efficient means of satisfying the individual and group needs than does individual action.

More specifically, as a social system, the church may be viewed as composed of certain basic elements, namely: goals, or objectives, positions and roles, a ranking structure, a variety of facilities, sentiments or emotional content, belief or knowledge, power, sanction, and norms. When dealing with such a nucleated or spacially oriented system as a local rural church, territoriality also becomes a useful concept.

Consider territoriality first. A recent report indicates that open country churches constituted 90 percent of all local churches dissolved during the previous thirty years. What few open country churches still remain will undoubtedly experience the continuing trend of dissolution or relocation into populating centers. In other ways the geographic area which a given local church serves will undoubtedly continue to see changes in size and demographic characteristics.

Briefly note the content of each of the elements just listed.

1. **Objectives** — Objectives well defined and internalized by members of an organization give that organization direction. Rural church leaders are beginning to give serious consideration to both, a sharper definition and a redefinition of the basic and secondary objectives of the rural church and to the internalization of these objectives by its local leadership and laity.

2. **Positions and Roles** — Roles provide the ways in which individuals are to help achieve the goals of the organization. That is, the role of the minister prescribes how a minister should act in a given situation — the pulpit, on the street, etc. It is sometimes more convenient to think of the minister as occupying a position consisting of many roles. In thise sense, the position of minister includes such roles as expositor of the scriptures, evangelist, counselor, business executive and many others. Likewise the roles associated with other positions within the church from member on, specify the actions expected of occupant

of the position. The strength or weakness of a local organization is in large part dependent upon the adequacy of these roles, their recognition and internalization by leaders and laity alike, and finally, their successful performance.

3. **Structure** — These positions are related to each other in specified ways in an adequate social organization. Just as in a building, structural arrangements call for certain relationships between doors, windows, walls, joists and foundation, so in the church as a social organization, stable and efficient relationships between the different positions are essential. Unless the relationship of minister and chairman of the church board, or any other positions within the organization are defined and the definition is followed in action, the organization's efficiency will be impaired.

4. **Facilities** — Buildings, pews, hymn books, altars, classrooms and sometimes gymnasiums all facilitate the local congregations achieving the church's goals. Here, as in reference to the other elements, it might be asked: How adequate are facilities? What are recent trends in the development of facilities? If these trends continue, what will be the facilities for the rural church in 1965? And above all, what alteration of current facilities and what new facilities would enhance the effectiveness of the rural church's ministry in 1965?

5. **Sentiment** — Sentiment consists of feelings or emotions which prompt motivation toward the personal and group actions called for by the various roles designed to achieve the group's objectives. In the church these include feelings of reverence, awe, piety, stewardship and responsibility to a higher power and a higher law in carrying on the activities of the church. Hopefully the sentiments will guide the member as he works and plays in shop or field, in home or community, by himself or with others.

Some pertinent questions are: What sentiments are being fostered? Which are being emphasized? Which might be emphasized more? What new ones might strengthen the mission of the church in rural America during the next five years?

6. **Belief** — Beliefs are a more important part of the church than of other social organizations within our society. To the church, certain beliefs are basic and essential; others are highly desirable, and yet others are completely unacceptable. A core of generally accepted beliefs (or that which is sometimes referred to as common knowledge) is essential for the maintenance of a social system. If there is disagreement on basic and essential beliefs by significant portions of an organization's constituency, energy which might better be utilized positively is dissipated in conflict over beliefs. In facing towards 1965, rural churches will want to strive for sufficient common core of beliefs among their members, as well as tolerance towards differences. A recognition of, and a tolerance for differences can be as essential as acceptance of a basic core of beliefs.

7. **Power** — Power is the capacity to control. This control may be derived from either authority or influence. Authority differs from influence in that authority is a right assigned by the group to the person performing his role

in a position assigned him. It involves the right to demand or restrain behavior of another person. Thus the Sunday School or church school teacher has the right to demand that the members of the class pay attention, that they follow his directions and that they do not engage in activities which would hinder the group's efforts. On the other hand, influence rests largely on personal characteristics, personal appeals. Both are generally essential for the successful performance of a person in positions of responsibility within the church. Without sufficient delegated authority, plus personal influence, neither clergy nor laity can effectively carry out their different responsibilities.

The contribution which the rural church will make rests in part on answers to such questions as: Is there sufficient assignment of power and its distribution within the various positions in rural churches? Is responsibility accompanied by comitant degrees of authority? Are status, prestige and facilities which allow for the occupant of the position of responsibility to develop his personal influence available and utilized?

8. **Sanctions** — Sanction devices designed to induce conformity, that is, to induce "proper" behavior, sentiments and beliefs. Sanctions may be either positive or negative. Positive sanctions tend to be in the nature of rewards; financial, social, psychological or spiritual rewards. The negative are in the nature of punishments. In building for 1965, what rewards and what punishments are available to the rural church? How might they be used more effectively?

9. **Norms** — Norms are the prescribed rules of acceptable and unacceptable behavior attitudes and beliefs for members of an organization. As such, the norms include the expected behavior. It is self evident that the church will contribute more effectively and influence the development of its community if the leadership and the membership at large accept a common set of norms as to beliefs, attitudes and behavior. Where the bishop, superintendent or other regional officer, pastor, the local church board or council and the members disagree on norms or their importance, that church's voice will carry little conviction within the community. Even differences between denominations are seriously hampering the church's current influence. Fortunately, there is a trend toward less emphasis on difference and more on the common mission of all churches.

This picture of the rural church has purposely, and of necessity, been sketched with broad strokes of the brush rather than in greater detail. It was designed to suggest ways in which the rural church of today might strengthen its contribution to rural life.

Changing Social - Economic Patterns — In order to effectively plan within a complex mass industrial society a careful examination of the environment within which an institution will operate is important. Therefore, the focus is now rather abruptly shifted to sketching in broad outline the social and economic scene within which the rural church will be operating.

We all agree we are living in a changing society. But are we really

aware of how rapidly things are changing? In 57 years we have come from kitty-hawk to the jet age and are now embarking on the rocket age. Within the life span of many people now alive we have moved from the feeble attempts to fly at a height little above the reach of the human hand to where today a man-made object is reporting back to us from a distance of millions of miles out in space.

Production wise one farm worker could supply the needs of only five persons during the early history of our country. Today one farm worker produces for twenty-eight persons.

Yet if change over the recent decades seems rapid, that rate of change will seem as nothing compared to the changes of the next decade. It took us 57 years to learn to fly fifteen miles high, after we once learned to get off the ground. It should take us at most ten years to move from that fifteen miles to thousands of miles — even the possible exploration of other planets. I recently served as consultant in the deliberations of a board of directors whose company had taken thirty years to build up assets of fifteen million dollars. These hard-headed businessmen expect to double their accomplishment of the last thirty years during the next five years.

We are indeed living in a rapidly changing world! These changes are not restricted to man's environment, they extend to man himself. For example, recent world population increases have been so rapid that three-fifths of all people ever born are still living today; one-fourth of all people who have reached age 65 throughout the history of mankind are still living today. We are told there are today more people living in the world than have died since Adam.

Along with changes in technology and population, various significant changes in the social organization are also occuring. With increases in efficiency of production and distribution, the farmer, the factory worker, the skilled tradesmen and others along with their families are finding more time for self-development and pursuit of leisure activities. Reduction of labor demands is permitting us more time at school for more of our youth, earlier retirement for the aging and more time for play and worship for the population in general.

Concomitant changes are occuring in our various social institutions. Consider for example, the family, school, government and economy.

1. **The Family** — Between now and 1965 the church will deal with a society in which marriage and family is more popular than it has been at any time throughout the history of the western world. A higher proportion of the population is married, we are marrying at a younger age (approximately 20 years for women and 22 for men). Although American families today on the average have only half as many children as at the turn of the century, family size again has been increasing since the years of depression. Today the average rural farm family consists of four people; the rural - nonfarm family living in small towns and in the open country, of 3.5 persons, and the urban family averages 3.3 persons.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Where a generation ago farm and small town children were still considered an economic asset, they, like their counterpart in the urban areas, have become an economic liability. Yet our affluence is such that this has not deterred parenthood.

Families are completing childbearing at an earlier age, generally before the mother is thirty years old. This is allowing increasing proportions of married women to enter the labor force. One consequence is increased family income, another the problem of child care for school aged children. Today approximately one-third of urban and one-fourth of rural farm women are engaged in gainful employment outside the home.

Children tend to leave the home at the age of 17 to 20 for girls and only slightly later for boys. One consequence is an empty nest with only the husband and wife left at home for a period of some seventeen years before the death of either one. Only a genegation ago, one of the parents (on the average) died before the last child left the home. The time formerly allotted by parents to child rearing is now available for other activities. Can the church transform the resulting hours of boredom to more positive use?

The family has ceased to be an economic unit in the production sense and largely so in the consumption sense. More and more each member is determining what he shall eat, wear and do. Even breakfast food must now be sold to the child rather than the parent is witnessed to by the selection of shows by such companies as General Mills. The church may find it advantageous to be as concerned with appealing to the different individuals within the family.

2. **The School** — Another social institution with which the rural church must live is the school. It is changing rapidly. Consolidation, professionalization, specialization and concentration may all be observed in the rural communitys' schools. Teaching is being professionalized by increasing demands for at least bachelors degrees, and often masters degrees and special certificates. The small one room school has been replaced largely by larger consolidated units. This is just beginning to happen to the rural church.

An increasingly large proportion of America's youth is going to school and staying in school longer. Today the idea of attending college is almost as widely accepted as was the idea of attending high school a generation ago. As this aspiration becomes reality for more and more rural communities, will the present educational background of local church leadership (particularly of the clergy) be sufficient to provide spiritual and social council to the new generation? There is reason to doubt that it will.

In addition there is increased diversification of the school curriculum so that today's youth often studies things which are as new to their parents as to the pupils. If not already so, then within the next five years in most of our schools, the seventh grader will find his father incapable of helping him solve his problems in seventh grade mathematics.

3. **Government** — Government is another basic institution whose actions can enhance or hinder the rural church and in turn can be influenced by the rural church through the political action of its members. It has not been dormant. Whether we like to admit it or not, rural areas are looking more and more to state and federal governments for the provision of a growing list of services. Activities associated with welfare, building and maintence of roads, police protection and the control of the economy have been shifting from local to higher levels of government. This is part of the general social pattern towards centralization of control. Higher costs in these governments necessarily tend to follow.

Social controls formerly exercised informally by the neighborhood are being replaced, even in rural areas, by formal controls; and locality groups are being replaced by interest groups. As business and social organizations have grown in size and power, we have found no alternative to increasing government to a stature where it could deal with these effectively.

Rural areas are experiencing a professionalization and specialization of personnel in government so that no longer is just about anybody in the community thought competent to serve in an elective or appointive position. Even the smaller communities are beginning to hire professional city managers and other specialized personnel in order to increase government efficiency.

4. **Business** — The changes in the economic institution may not be quite as apparent but are just as significant to an understanding of the future of the church. Farming or shopkeeping, or most any other enterprise in the small town and open country, as a way of life, are slowly but surely becoming strictly business enterprises. The family farm and shop are increasingly demanding less work by members of the family other than the primary breadwinner. As a consequence, many of the values formerly associated with the family farm and the family business are largely figments of the imagination. Research no longer shows the rural environment particularly conducive to child rearing. Young people are less and less going into family farming or a family business for its advantages to family living and rearing children but simply as a livelihood. By 1965, even more so than today, decisions to farm or not to farm, to stay in a small town or to move to the larger city, to go into this or that trade will be based on economic decisions, cultural advantages and social opportunities of the job and residential area unless new values are developed for rural living. In several ways the new patterns of suburban cooperativeness, friendliness and emphasis on the quality of facilities and public services may show the way to a renewal of rural living values. On each of these, small towns and farms promise to compete less, rather than more effectively within the developing value system. An institution within our society which should be most competent to effectively examine and foster the development of needed values is the church. However, that it will have any more impact upon the direction of their development during the next decade than it did during the last is doubtful from today's vantage point.

Other changes in the economic institution involve increased size; the

supermarket is replacing the small store, the sprawling factory the blacksmith shop, the larger farm the smaller subsistence operation. Also, almost everywhere there is specialization, concentration, integration and increased complexity or organization designed to utilize more effectively management potential and other personnel resources. There is growing utilization of labor saving devices through machines and improved operating techniques.

Current Trends And The Rural Church — Note the dual significance of the aforementioned trends to the contribution which the church could make to rural life during the next five years. On the one hand, they are changing the expectations, behaviors and values of the congregation's members, some to the advantages, some to the disadvantage of the church as a social institution. On the other hand, these trends may be taken as reflecting the society's experience with social institutions in general.

The implications of the latter for the church are that if, in all other areas of social organization, consolidation of local units, integration of management, specialization of personnel, diversification of services, concentration of facilities and upgrading of employees are found to increase the effectiveness of the organization, will not the public demand the same of the church? It is reasonable to expect that farmers, who have seen their efficiency in production increase sixfold during the last century will expect increased efficiency from their church organization. To be specific, as a farmer a century ago, he produced for five people; today, he does so for 28; by 1965 for 35, and by 1970 for 45 or 50. Would he be unreasonable in expecting sufficient improvement in the training of his pastor, the organization of his church and the adequacy of church facilities to allow similar increases in efficiency in that the adequacy of church facilities to allow similar increases in efficiency in that institution? Certainly the contributions of an omniscent being could not be used to explain failure of the church to do so in either its spiritual or temporal aspects.

The recently growing interest in objective self appraisal among Catholic, Jewish and Protestant groups alike, lends foundation to the hope that increased efficiency will characterize the rural church in 1965.

The People — Next, consider the very life blood of any social organization, namely people. Envisage the rural church of 1965 without people. Without people, it is but a mass of brick and mortar, of beams and stained glass, of wood and stone in ornate form — without people it is something that belongs to the past rather than to the present or future; it is a product rather than a producer.

The census of 1960 will show a growing nation on the move. It will show a population that is shifting as it grows, a people prospering and becoming younger as the country ages. It will show 180 million people, almost 30 million more than in 1950, and there is every reason to expect that the growth in population will continue well beyond 1965. It will show almost 50 million of the 180 million to be in school and some 70 million to have jobs. Their average family income of $6,700.00 a year represents a 50 percent increase over 1950.

Rural to Urban Trend — In keeping with this, marked changes are expected in labor demands during the next decade. The greatest increase in employment demand will occur in the professional and technical categories where an increase of over 40 percent is expected. In turn, in most of the other employment categories, increases of from 17 to 30 percent should be the rule. Only the category of farmers and farm workers is expected to decline and that by some 17 percent. On the whole, the next five to ten years promise a continuing shift from agriculture to a predominantly non-agricultural industrial economy. The farm population is expected to drop from its current 21 million to less than 17 million. Farmers, who had at one time constituted 90 percent of our population and at the turn of the century still represented 50 percent, today account for about 10 percent of the labor force and within another decade may account for no more than 5 percent.

As agriculture experiences rationalization in production, farmers' demands for quality and quantity of services (both secular and religious) should increase. The net result is expected so that the demand for personnel in the smaller communities which effectively and efficiently meet this demand should at least be able to maintain their present status, if not grow somewhat. This growth can most legitimately be expected where local leadership is sufficiently dynamic to also develop processing and manufacturing facilities which add value to the raw materials available within its environment or which add value to items locally consumed whether they originate within the community or not.

The population increase which has just occurred and which is expected to continue is largely a suburban phenomenon. Much to their chagrin, many of our major cities have actually lost population along with rural areas during the last decade. This shift of population has significance far beyond mere loss of membership in the rural or downtown churches. For instance, one consequence is a shift in political power at practically every level of government from the national to the local school district. If rural interests are to continue to be heard the hearing they formerly had, the quality of rural leadership must increase to make up for relative loss in quantity of population. The church, since it is the institution providing more opportunities for leadership experience than any other single social organization in rural America, will have a major responsibility in this task.

Only as this leadership can articulate the impact of government action upon local communities will the nation be able to give adequate consideration to the justices and injustices of such policies as the Soil Conservation Reserve. What is the effect of a program that takes a third to one-half of the land in some counties out of cultivation? How does it effect the farm family, the merchant, the school, the church, the local community? These questions, and many more, need to be answered before effective planning can be done for building programs, making personnel assignments and doing program content development for the rural church of 1965.

Building for '65 — So far we have examined the nature of the rural church as a social institution and the socio-economic environment within which it

operates. Let the remainder of our efforts explore ways in which the rural church may increase its potential for contributing to the development of rural life during the next five years. Aside from its primary function in the spiritual realm, the church has and presumably will continue to contribute in other ways. Although one could assign to the church a long list of other functions, it seems best here to consider only a few examples of the more significant ones. As already suggested, a community, in fact a society, supports a given institution largely to the extent that it values its contribution.

It is therefore realistically meaningful to ask, "What contributions can the church make to rural life?" It can provide special spiritual meaning to rural living by capitalizing on its nearness to nature, its slower pace, its opportunities for quiet reflection.

The church can be expected to accept responsibility for devising a system of values which give meaning to all activities of rural life. Such a system must assign differential values to different activities: economic, social, spiritual, recreational, or whatever the activity may be. To be heard either in or out of the church, its voice will need to be less equivocal and more often used than in the past.

Some churchmen have suggested that the church needs to permeate the ruralites entire life, including the codes for his economic behavior. To do so, the church would need to answer such questions as: What are the objections and wants of rural America? To what extent are these legitimate or not legitimate? What should be the criteria for the establishment of our goals? What about surpluses when people are starving? What about encouraging people to stay in rural areas when job demands do not require it? What of the larger questions of war and international relations? An objective appraisal suggests that the church is today probably even less adequately prepared to answer many such questions than are other units within our society.

Historically, the church has served a social function. In the future it could contribute significantly to an adjustment of rural-urban differences, particularly in the metropolitan fringe areas where the blue collar, the gray collar and the white collar are intermingling more and more. Through contact among its leaders, the rural clergy can interpret rural life to urban leadership and in turn the urban to their rural counterparts, each then carrying a more realistic account to his parish.

In addition to the group guidance provided in developing and confirming values, the rural church may strengthen personal guidance. It has recently taken on greater responsibilities in family and youth counseling, particularly in helping young people in choices of mate, vocation, and the pattern for organization of the new family. Much more could be done.

Finally, the rural church can increase its contribution to the development of rural leadership. To accomplish this, it can design programs to help rural young people to obtain necessary education and training and to establish themselves within the rural community. In some cases this involves no more

than showing parents how they might arrange their finances to provide both these opportunities for their children and security for their own old age. Both can often be done at no disadvantage over otherwise investing or depositing family resources in a savings account.

In making such, and other, contributions the rural church in the next five years will increasingly be faced by a number of problems. As crop insurance is increasingly found to be a more reliable guarantee (even if somewhat more costly) against crop failure than prayer for rain, grain elevators will increasingly outreach church spires in a rural village as they for some time have in our cities. As young people find greater satisfactions in the social and recreational activities provided by the school, commercial establishments and other social organizations, the church will less often be looked upon as an opportunity for children to get to play together, for teenage boys and girls to learn to know each other and for adults to exchange information and news. To compete, the rural church may well have to specialize in a limited number of functions and to professionalize its personnel in the performance of these. It may be found more advantageous to do a few things well than many things poorly.

At the same time, the church which narrows its services to those of the spiritual only, may well lose to that church or other organization which serves a wider diversity of needs, much as the corner grocery is losing out to the supermarket. This competition is a growing reality. A recent study reported by James Carr in his **Bright Future: A New Day for the Town and Country Church** (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press) noted more than 200 different meetings held each month exclusive of church meetings to be attended by the people in a county of 17,000 population. Contrast this to the day when Sunday and at least one, if not two, other evenings of the week were set aside for church.

Another problem, and possibly a blessing for the church, will be the increasing interaction of local congregations with persons of other faiths, religiously, politically, economically and culturally. As a result, doctrinal differences which once inspired loyalty will become less meaningful as former stereotypes of whom God loves and who is a child of the Devil are beclouded by growing contacts between members of diverse orientations. It can also breed an appreciation for one's own beliefs and values when these are of high quality.

A growing religious illiteracy is noted by Wilfred Bockelman in his **On Good Soil** published last year (New York: Friendship Press) as well as by Charles W. Gilkey, formerly of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago and Garrett Biblical Institute (**In Protestant Thought in the Twentieth Century,** ed. by Arnold S. Nash, New York: MacMillan Company, 1951). As Bible studies and the Biblical stories of Ruth, of Joseph, of David, etc. are lost before the impact of Robin Hood, The Lone Ranger, and Davy Crockett, the rural pastor and Sunday School teacher may find it necessary to develop a language which today's people understand. The language of the church is a foreign tongue to many younger Americans.

Another potential problem is the intellectual gap between laymen and clergy noted in a recent issue of **The Commonweal** (Daniel J. Callahan, April 3, 1959, pp. 9-11.) Callahan suggests that two mutually hostile strata may develop within the church: the one absorbed in theology and oblivious of the liberal arts and science, the other captivated by the arts and sciences, each strata failing to understand the other. The answers would not seem to be decreased scientific information to the farmer and businessman on soil testing, artificial insemination, the psychology of advertising or on human motivation, but rather an increased emphasis upon scientific developments and an appreciation of the arts in the formal and inservice training of the clergy.

Possibly the greatest problem to be faced by the church in the immediate future is a rationalization of its message, its organization, and its program to more effectively meet the tremendous challenge of the present decade, without compromising its basic function of speaking out for a Higher Power. It cannot compromise its divine mission of spiritual redemption nor of guidance to man in his temporal search for a better life through its exhortation and rebuke. For the rural church to become all things to all men would be to destroy its reason for existence. Likewise, to remain aloof of the individual's everyday concerns would most likely decrease its impact on his spiritual life.

In closing, how might the church increase its preparedness for dealing with the problems and opportunities it will encounter between now and 1965? The various town and country departments have released a variety of excellent suggestions. Let me list here only a few which grow out of our discussion. The church must: (1) Spell out its objectives, including the beliefs and values as they relate in concrete form to rural life. (2) Re-examine its social organization at all levels of administration with particular attention to the redefinition of roles to be assigned to individuals occupying different positions and the internalization of these roles by the leadership and laity alike. This includes assigning to specified positions within the organization such roles as that of good preaching, skilled counseling, lively socializing, gifted organizing, accomplished diplomacy, shrewd coaching and athletic direction, wise planning and building and a host of other duties, along with providing for the development of these skills and rewarding those who excel in them. (3) Develop and acquire more attractive, efficient facilities to help in the effective performance by reduced personnel of those functions which the accepted goals of the local congregation and/or of the church hierarchy, demand of it and its leadership.

In all of this it will be essential for the church to go out to the community and to the people, not only physically but spiritually and mentally. This means bringing religion to them in their everyday life as well as in their devotions and worship.

All this calls, not for less prayer and study of the scriptures but rather increased utilization of the growing knowledge in public relations and personal motivation, along with an increased understanding of the rapidly changing social environment within which the members of a rural congregation as well as of the church at large must function.

RURAL LIFE IN '65

The rural social organization which in 1965 wishes to look back upon the first five years of the decade will need to continually reassess (a) its current strengths, weaknesses, successes and failures; (b) the problems faced by its contemporary constituency, and (c) the efficiency and effectiveness of its methods for solving those problems. The rewards to those who do so successfully should be great, the success of those who fail to is doubtful.

THE FARM IN 1965

PAUL C. JOHNSON
Editor, Prairie Farmer

We are living in an age when almost anything can happen. This is most certainly true of farming, and so any attempt to chart the future is bound to have its pitfalls. However, since both farmers and the business people who supply them have to make plans for the future, I will set down some of the developments which I believe will come about in the next ten years.

The kind of farming we have in the future will depend on the powerful economic forces of our age, but these will undoubtedly be tempered by our ideas of what farming should be.

It is risky indeed to disregard these economic forces. Whenever we substitute legislation for economic law we have to take on the responsibility of establishing certain norms and social controls which may be very hard to enforce.

For my part, I would rather reject the "economic determinism" of both the right and the left. The one is the central idea of communism that material things and the full belly are the only things which count in the world. The other is the idea of unbridled capitalism that economic laws are God-given and therefore the only rules which will work in our society.

Much better than these is the principle of good stewardship which comes to us primarily from the church. This is the idea that every human being has responsibilities both spiritual and useful and that it is his duty to make the fullest use of both his own abilities and the tools which are made available to him by science and experience.

Let's look at some of the characteristics of modern farming in the light of this ideal of stewardship. Today's farmer and his family can produce anywhere from 3 to 10 times as much as was possible in grandfather's day. This is possible because we know a great deal more about farming and we have better seed, better livestock and much better machinery at our disposal. There can be no doubt that farmers like to use modern machinery and approved scientific methods. Nobody really wants to turn the clock back to grandfather's way of farming.

Because the farm family can do much more, it follows that the farm business must be enlarged, both in number of acres and in numbers of livestock, to keep the family fruitfully employed. The 80 or 160-acre farm may have been a correct size for the family farm in the days of the Homestead Act, but this is no longer true in our generation.

It also follows that the larger, mechanized farm is a business farm calling for a larger investment and greater managerial capacity. If it takes $100,000 or more in land and equipment to keep a modern farm family fruitfully em-

ployed, it stands to reason that a modern farmer must have the education and the ability to run successfully a business of this size.

Our cherished American tradition that farming is a way of life tends to break down as farming becomes more and more like a business in town. Indeed, a modern, well-equipped farm now requires capital and business ability equal to that required by most of the business enterprises along Main Street.

We can easily see that the rural way of life is no longer the sole property of the commercial farmer. The rural community is now made up not only of full-time farmers but part-time farmers, ex-farmers who work in town, acreage owners who live in the country and many other business and professional people who are a part of small-town life. All of these people now have a hand in determining the rural tradition and framing the work habits, principles and morals which the rural community has to offer to the nation.

Behind all the furor over farm programs and farm prices is the fact that we have not yet learned to live with the explosive productivity of this modern farm. Nor have we yet accustomed ourselves to the idea that there will be fewer farmers in the future because the modern farm is vastly more productive than the farmer of the past. Undoubtedly we will be working on these adjustments for many years to come and we will need to apply more patience and intelligent planning to the problem than we have applied in recent years.

Any analysis of modern farming would not be complete, however, without calling to mind some of the reasons why farming is different from most other businesses. These have an important bearing on whether farming will become fully industrialized or whether it will retain its present position of being an independent, family-sized economic unit.

It is very difficult to classify or even to put a fair price on the human effort which goes into farming. A lot of the "extras" which determine success in farming can be traced to the extra time and extra pains which the farmer will put in because he is personally interested in the business. These extras are also contributed by other members of the family, and even the hired help who will often be just as interested in doing a good job as the owner. It is hard to put a value on the time a man spends sitting up with the sows at farrowing time in order to save more pigs, or running the tractor all night to get in the corn crop during a few precious days when the soil conditions are right. It is completely true that you can't learn farming entirely out of a book or from an operations manual, but that part of success comes from having a feel for handling crops and livestock.

There is also the seasonality in farming which is very difficult to work into a factory system. Broiler growing can be industrialized with considerable success, but this may not be true of growing crops or most kinds of livestock. The farm family with a diversified operation still has the best chance of filling out the work year so that employment will be reasonably fruitful the year around. Even though children who go to high school and college lose

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

a good deal of their work value on the farm, it is still true that a great deal of the labor on the farm is supplied by the wife and children.

Independent farmers also develop a certain resiliency which has a real economic value. They can plow profits back into their capital investment very quickly in a good year, and they are willing to live on capital and curtail their buying in a bad year. In this respect they have a big advantage over a corporation carrying on the same kind of business and answering to a group of stockholders.

As a matter of fact, several of the above characteristics of farming argue that the farm as a family business will remain a strong competitor of larger corporate operations in agriculture.

I think it is very likely that we can retain farming as an independent economic unit, and that a larger family farm, or perhaps a two-family farm, will emerge as the pattern of farming in our country. There's much to be said for the two-family farm rather than the family farm as the most desirable economic unit in our time.

This larger family-type farm does fit the needs of mechanization moderately well. There's a great deal to be said for having the farm big enough so that it will keep busy not only two adult men but a fairly complete set of modern machinery. If farms are so small that they cannot support adequate machinery, it will become necessary for farmers to either rent machines or hire their work done by custom operators. We know from long experience that good farmers don't like to do this because they recognize the value of getting a job done quickly when it needs to be done.

The two-family farm also has a great advantage in that it is geared to support two families, such as a father and a married son or two brothers in partnership. This leaves the way open for passing the land from one generation to the other. One of the tragedies of the smaller farm is that the married sons must leave to earn a living and when the father is ready to quit, none of the sons will want to return to the land.

The two-family farm also leaves a place for the farm-trained adult who can not muster enough capital or managerial skill to handle a modern farm on his own. Many hired men with families live a very good life on the farm and pour as much individual attention into the farm as the owner himself. If the hired man is young and able, it is also possible that he may become an owner some day if there are no heirs in the family who want to farm.

One of the most attractive features of the two-family farm is that it can open the door to a much higher standard of living for both families. One of the tragedies of the smaller farms is that it was impossible for anyone to get away from the work and the routine of caring for livestock. With two competent families in the same business it is possible to work in vacations, travel, community participation, and there is a better chance for children to get away to school.

What chance has this two-family farm got in the economic competition of the future? Undoubtedly, industrialization of farming will be tried. Will the efficiency of this larger family farm be equal to the task of competing with industrialized farming? I believe the chances of success are very good.

A few years ago the country was seething with reports of vertical integration and industrialized farming, but this trend seems to have lost much of its glamour. Big firms who have gone into farming have found that the troubles are many. Out in California today there is a big fight going on over the unionization of farm labor.

There can be no doubt that very large farms employing many families will be quickly unionized and that the labor-management problem will become a matter of real concern. What happens if a strike is called on the eve of harvest or the milkers called out on a unionized dairy?

There are signs now that many grandiose schemes for large-scale farming are not going well and the big companies are taking another look.

Personally, I think that the supermarket chains; the packers and the other processors do not want to take on the griefs of farming if they can get the product they need without it. This presents family farming with its greatest challenge today. Can we organize our output in quality, quantity and timing so as to supply the needs of these big processors and distributors?

I believe that family farming will need some help, however, to assure success in this world of industrial giants. Some of this help can come from government but most of it will be in the form of self-help through better planning and organization.

The government should help as much as it can in the effort to bring the total size of our farm production into line with the present demand and need. This should take the form of land retirement, both short-term and long-range, and we will probably need some price help while this adjustment is going on. However, we should back away from price supports that encourage people to expand farming over and beyond the present need. I am still skeptical about the success of price and quota legislation because I am afraid it will multiply our troubles in the long run. However, we must do whatever is necessary to keep the economic health of our farming business.

It is well to remember that even the large farmer is very small when it comes to the volume of his produce in the market place. One of our principal troubles is the seeming impossibility of organizing our production and marketing to give us needed strength in the market place. Building new marketing mechanisms to deal with the present inequalities in the market is the biggest single job that faces agriculture today.

I also think that we need to understand better the place of the food producer in the American economic system. If there are fewer farmers, those remaining certainly will be more important because they furnish the

base for nearly 50 percent of our economy. Serious mistakes in dealing with our agricultural economy can have very serious repercussions. If city voters and city congressmen are to have the deciding votes in determining agricultural policies of the future, it is up to us to explain the importance of their decisions.

I believe it will be best for the country if farming can remain primarily in the hands of independent economic units, such as the larger family farm which I have described. I believe this kind of unit has enough strength in our competitive economy to justify its future, but I also think we must be alert to the necessity of making this competition fair.

THE COMMUNITY IN 1965

OTTO G. HOIBERG
Head, Community Services
University Extension Division
University of Nebraska

Periods of rapid social change are often characterized by uncertainty, confusion and dismay among the people affected. This is true, first, because various phases of the old order are threatened and we can't be sure whether or not the threatened phases are basic to our way of life. We don't know whether we are at the point of losing something fundamental or perhaps only something that has served its purpose and should actually be replaced. Second, the human being is an emotional creature who finds it difficult to think objectively about a phenomenon as close to himself as his way of life. Failing to do this, he is unable to develop realistic action programs to deal with problems inherent in the changing times. Third, man is a procrastinator. He tends to let his community problems reach the crisis stage before he really tries to do anything about them. This tends to make any action taken difficult, expensive and relatively ineffective.

Much of the grief that the rural community encounters today has its origin in these three problems. I trust that my remarks today and the discussion which will follow may assist us in finding solutions to them.

In approaching our topic, "The Community in 1965," let us first enumerate briefly some of the social and economic trends which lie at the roots of much of our concern in rural areas:

1. **Mechanization of agriculture.** This enables a teen-age boy to sit on a self-propelled combine today and do the work which one generation ago required six bundle teams and a threshing rig, to say nothing of the equipment and personnel involved in the harvesting operation. This mechanization is accompanied by increased specialization and great stress upon efficiency.

2. **Growth of larger (and fewer) farms.** This is inevitable if farmers want to make a decent living from their farming operations -- and they do. A small farm will no longer yield an adequate return on the fantastic capital investment required of the modern farmer.

3. **Decline of the farm population.** Probably 9 out of 10 Americans were farmers in the early days of our republic. By 1950 this had fallen to 15 percent, with a further decline to about 12 percent at present. Joseph Ackerman has suggested the possibility that this trend may eventually result in village residence rather than open-country residence of the farmers who

ultimately will remain to till the soil in parts of the Great Plains and Corn Belt.

4. **Disappearance of open-country social institutions.** The one-room schoolhouses and churches which once dotted the open countryside are becoming a thing of the past, and with them are going the neighborhoods which so often were centered about them.

5. **Expanding trade and service areas around the larger trade centers,** with hamlets and the smaller villages losing ground. I don't know how a day of the week can disappear, but "Saturday Night" has literally vanished from thousands of our smaller towns as rural people from ever-larger areas gravitate to the larger centers for shopping and recreation.

6. **Greater interdependence between the farm and nonfarm elements of our economy.** Vertical integration is a much-discussed case in point, where production, processing and distribution are combined so far as the decision-making process is concerned.

7. **Urbanization or rurbanization.** Thanks to our high degree of mobility and remarkable means of communication, rural and urban people are becoming more and more alike. The contrasts pointed up so succinctly by the Commission on Country Life half a century ago are far less pronounced today. This applies across the board to appearance, behavior, values, interests and standards of living.

8. **Increase in part-time farming.** To illustrate, Phillip F. Aylesworth has pointed out that "in 1958, nearly one-third of the income of the farm population came from non-farm sources."* In the same year, "nearly 40% of all working farm people held non-farm jobs, compared to only 14% in 1930."**

9. **Decentralization of industry.** This trend is aided and abetted by rural communities all over the nation which are seeking new employment opportunities for their excess farm youth and for adults who are underemployed or who need extra money.

10. **Suburbanization.** The rural-urban fringe is the fastest growing element of our population today. As a part of this panorama, hundreds of "bedroom towns" are now in process of formation around our larger population centers. An erstwhile peaceful little village of 400 population finds that fifty new houses have been erected almost overnight just outside its corporate limits by an urban developer. Question: To what extent can the new commuters be made an integral part of the small community?

11. **Increasing recognition of the importance of education.** Whether a rural person intends to farm or to work in a town, it is becoming clear to him that he needs a good general education with some degree of speciali-

*"Keeping Abreast of Change in the Rural Community", U.S.D.A., Federal Extension Service, Agricultural Information Bulletin, No. 215, Oct. 1959, p. 1.
**Ibid, p. 5.

zation in his chosen field if he is to make the most of himself. Recognition of this fact is leading to a greater interest in formal education for rural youth and to an increased demand for many types of noncredit adult education.

12. **Increasing reliance upon government for assistance and control measures** in the interest of the farmer.

This list of rural trends is by no means exhaustive, but it is sufficiently comprehensive to serve our purpose at this time.

Let us now look, for a moment, at the question of why trends like these are important. It should be stressed that they are inherently neither good nor bad. Our evaluation of them — and therefore our decision as to what, if anything, to do about them — should be made in the light of their effects upon values which we consider important in the rural scene. What, then, are some of these values, and what impact are the aforementioned social trends having upon them?

One of the distinguishing and historically significant features of rural community life in the United States has been **mutual aid** — the art of working together in a neighborly way to obtain common ends. The older folks of today cast nostalgic glances back to bygone quilting bees, barn raisings, threshing days, and the like. Few observers will deny that the strong mutual aid of yore has suffered at the hands of trends such as the mechanization of agriculture (making cooperative work activities unnecessary), the disappearance of open-country social institutions which served as focal points for neighborhood activities, and the growing tendency of farm people to adopt the more formal ways and attitudes of their urban brethren.

It appears to me, however, that we need not be greatly disturbed over this apparent threat to the element of mutual aid in our rural value system. Careful scrutiny reveals that the practice of mutual aid is disappearing primarily where the need for it no longer exists, namely in connection with the regular farm operations. Why bring equipment and personnel from six families together for a threshing operation that can now be handled by a farmer and his son, alone? When the need for a particular type of operation no longer exists, it should be discontinued, and that is precisely what has happened here.

However, I foresee new needs arising to which a modified pattern of mutual aid may have to be applied. As the years pass, the farmer finds it necessary to purchase more and more expensive equipment, forcing him to farm larger acreages in order to get an adequate return on his investment. It is conceivable that this problem could be eased a bit by some type of cooperative ownership and joint use of at least the more expensive equipment items.

In any event, mutual aid still exists in those phases of rural living where there is a current need for it. Let the misfortunes of fire, tornado or illness strike a farm family today and observe the forceful, heartwarming way in which the mutual aid pattern springs into action. Mutual aid is not headed

for extinction as a part of the rural value system. Rather, it is undergoing a normal adjustment to changing needs.

Closely related to mutual aid, as applied to farm operations and the rural home, is the principle of **voluntary cooperative effort for community improvement.** The latter has been a great and enduring element of the rural value system through the years, but current trends are making inroads upon it. To be sure, almost any rural community can point with pride to one or more community or organizational projects which have been implemented through voluntary group action, but this pattern of action is on the downgrade due to the adoption of urban ways and our tendency to rely more and more upon government programs at all levels for getting our jobs done.

Please do not misunderstand. I do not favor the elimination of our current law enforcement programs and a return to posses and vigilantes. I do not decry the use of tax dollars for libraries, public recreation programs, street construction and maintenance, and the like; nor do I look with disfavor upon government programs to prevent or counteract a collapse of farm prices. The trend toward implementing more and more of our common goals through tax-supported agencies is normal and essential, but we must not place our entire trust in this approach.

Foreign visitors to the United States frequently express a strong interest in the extent to which voluntary group effort still prevails in our country. Rural America has been a historic stronghold of this behavior pattern. It represents a way of getting many things done that the rural community could not otherwise afford and, even more, it provides a type of group therapy which helps to cure some of our current community ills. Community spirit seems to reach a peak where friends and neighbors roll up their sleeves and go to work together on a job that needs to be done.

A third outstanding element of rural values that we need to consider in the light of social and economic trends is the essentially **personal quality of human relationships.** The small community has traditionally been characterized by a friendly, informal and unsophisticated social atmosphere which a German sociologist years ago labelled **Gemeinschaft.** Anyone who doubts the importance of this type of relationship among men need only observe the modern city where it has all but disappeared except within the confines of small interest groups and the like.

In urban centers one sees repeated efforts to re-establish a face-to-face, neighborly type of relationship among people; witness the Hyde Park - Kenwood urban redevelopment project in Chicago or the community council movement in Kansas City. This type of interpersonal relationship has something to offer to society which cannot be obtained by any other means. Baker Brownell goes so far as to state that where it disappears, the social phenomenon called "community" also vanishes.

Now, what is happening to this valuable culture trait in the contemporary rural community? Obviously it has not disappeared, but certain of the social

trends mentioned are beginning to apply pressure. Our pattern of population growth is a case in point. The small trade centers are waning and the larger ones are increasing in size. In Nebraska, during recent decades, the dividing line has been somewhere around 1,000. Are we moving toward the day when nothing less than a trade center of perhaps several thousand population can survive in the struggle for existence? If so, a heavy blow will have been struck against the informal, personal type of community relationship under discussion, because the greater the population of a given trade center becomes, the less likelihood there is that such relationship will survive.

A friend of mines lives in a city of about 4,000 people which is showing a definite tendency toward growth. Not long ago he told me that his home town is changing in character and that he plans to move elsewhere if it passes the 5,000 mark. This man differs from his fellow citizens, most of whom tend to regard population increase as almost a fetish.

Other trends having an impact upon the informality and intimacy of community relationships are the mechanization of agriculture, the disappearance of open-country neighborhoods and social institutions, the expansion of trade areas and the increase in part-time farming. All of these tend to restrict the frequency and informality of the rural person's contacts with his neighbors and to multiply his contacts with others with whom his relationships are apt to be more impersonal. Further, the general diffusion of urban values and behavior patterns may well be encouraging the development of less personal inter-relations in rural areas.

The impact of current social trends upon this cultural value is potentially great and adverse. There is no point, however, in trying to arrest or reverse them. The only constructive approach, as I see it, is for rural people to study the evolving situation carefully, with the end in view of keeping the desired relationships generally alive and vigorous as long as possible, particularly in the expanding community, and strengthening them in every possible manner in special interest groups. If the day comes when the rural man no longer gives a friendly nod to the person whom he passes on the street, he must try to make up for this in his community club, commercial club, church, or other group. He **needs** close personal ties to other human beings, as does his urban brother.

As a fourth significant rural value, let us examine briefly the **relationships characteristic of the farm family.** The closely knit, well integrated, social and economic unit of an earlier day no longer exists. Both parents and children are increasingly finding it necessary or desirable to seek work outside the home. Expanding service centers are drawing members of the family apart for education, recreation and other essential activities. Increased mobility is curtailing the time spent by family members in the company of each other.

The distinctive features of the early farm family are fading and it is coming to resemble its urban counterpart more and more. Some observers

view this development with alarm and speak pessimistically of disintegration. Others look upon it as a normal, if troublesome, adjustment to changing times. My personal view is that the great inner strength of the traditional farm family is not necessarily incompatible with the features of the contemporary family. True, it is a relatively difficult matter to attain this strength in the modern setting; but the possibility exists, and it is up to us to work intelligently and energetically toward it by gearing the constructive efforts of all our social institutions to this challenging and all-important task.

A fifth distinctive element of rural living is the **intimate contact with nature** that it provides and the tempo which permits a bit of meditation and solitude now and then. The other evening, just at sundown, my wife and I drove out into the country, parked the car, and walked into a farmer's field where we sat down together on a bale of hay. As the sun's rays faded, we listened to the sounds of nature: a meadowlark, the chirping of crickets, but most of all, to the grand silence of the world about us. This surely is a tremendous value that people who live in cities have largely lost. The fact is, however, that even our friends who live on farms are losing it.

Mechanization of agriculture has transformed man's day-long companion in the field from a stately, living animal to an inanimate, fire-breathing tractor. The farm wife and youngsters no longer have much poultry to care for because this now requires a specialized approach. With part-time work off the farm increasing, there is less chance of "communing with nature". The "sundown farmer" who works eight hours in town and then spends half the night on a tractor can hardly be expected to enjoy the beauties of the summer night which surround him. As my wife and I sat on the bale of hay listening to the birds, the farm family in the nearby house was probably watching television or attending the wrestling matches in town just as we, their urban brethren, normally do.

The solution to this problem lies not in a frontal attack on social trends which appear to be separating us farther and farther from Mother Nature, but rather in a rededication of ourselves to personal contact with nature. Even in New York City the sky above is visible if we but take the time to look at it. We are all familiar with the passage: "Be **still** and know that I am God!" Whether we live in a rural or urban setting, we must recognize that this holds an important message for us all.

Among other important values that might be mentioned is **individualism;** but this, in my opinion, is not a distinctively rural trait. The same can be said for our major moral and spiritual values, all of which are outside the scope of the present discussion.

By now, you have probably begun to wonder whether or not I am going to tell you what the rural community will be like in 1965, because that is, after all, my assigned topic. To be perfectly honest, I have no intention of attempting a set of specific predictions for that or any other

year. There are so many variables in the world about us — from the unpredictable mind of Mr. K. to our currently astounding birth rate — that prediction, even five years ahead, becomes a hazardous business.

Instead, let me conclude my remarks with the following three points. First, the nature of the rural community of 1965 is not predetermined, as of the present time. It all depends . . .

Second, the twelve social and economic trends outlined at the outset, will in all probability continue in full force during the next five years and beyond. The social forces playing upon the rural community in 1965 will probably be similar to those of today, only more so!

Finally, the nature of the 1965 community will be determined in substantial measure by the ingenuity, alertness, vision and spirit of our rural people in dealing with these forces. Careful attention by the small community to analysis of its situation and to planning for its future can do a great deal to give direction to the road ahead. Illustrative of this are many small communities that are thriving and forging ahead in complete defiance of troublesome national trends.

The people of my own State of Nebraska have recently contributed over one million dollars of hard earned money to help finance the construction of an adult education center on the campus of their state university. One wing of the new center, the Hall of Nebraska Youth, will be dedicated to the vocational and cultural training of out-of-school young adults from both urban and rural areas. This development is symbolic of man's faith in the future and of stout confidence in his own ability to shape this future through planned, cooperative endeavor.

In looking ahead, we must, above all, understand clearly the values that we wish to preserve and then make a continuing effort to build these values into the changing social scene as it evolves.

THE RURAL FAMILY IN 1965

REV. EDWARD W. O'ROURKE, Executive Director
National Catholic Rural Life Conference

At first glance it might seem foolish to discuss the rural family in 1965. Society is changing so rapidly and so many forces influence family life that it is difficult to know clearly the state of family life today and almost impossible to predict what it will be five years from now.

Yet, there is a rational and urgently needed approach to this problem. We know a great deal about trends in agriculture, community life, education, etc. which will influence family life in 1965. We can derive from the traditions of our churches and nation basic principles and ideals according to which we can evaluate these trends. We can decide which trends we wish to encourage and accelerate and which we should oppose and neutralize. We must marshal economic, social, educational and religious institutions in an effort to better family life. Instead of letting blind forces determine the quality of rural family life in 1965, we should labor now to guarantee that it will be better than family life today.

The term, "rural", may refer to either the rural farm or rural nonfarm. In this paper we are chiefly concerned with the rural farm family. When we intend to include the nonfarm families, the context will so indicate.

RURAL FAMILY VALUES —

The family is the most basic of all our institutions. It powerfully affects both the individual and society. During the child's most formative years, the home and his parents make up his world. His character and attitudes are largely the result of his relationships with this little world. Since the family is the unit of which society is made, since society's future leaders and future trouble makers are being shaped in families today, welfare of society is chiefly determined by the quality of family life. Therefore, any force which affects family life is significant. Although other values must be weighed in deciding whether to encourage or oppose such a force, still its bearing on family life is often the most important single norm for evaluation.

It has been often asserted that the countryside is the **natural habitat of the family.** In other words, the family in rural areas enjoys an optimum opportunity to fulfill its potentialities. Although recent trends have lessened the differences between the environment of the rural family and that of urban families, I submit that the countryside can still be correctly referred to as the natural habitat of the family. The following are some of the reasons for this opinion:

American farm families are usually located a half mile or more from their closest neighbor. This makes it possible for the members of the family to work, pray and play together without numerous interruptions.

Moreover, farming is a family enterprise. Approximately 95 percent of all farms in the United States are operated by and for families. Each member of the family has a task to perform; even the small child helps with simple chores. Planning the farming operation, bookkeeping and similar tasks are usually shared by the father, mother and elder children of the family.

The child prospers in an environment of this sort. He realizes that he is not a liability to his parents. His work is a real contribution to the family's income. Gradually he develops a sense of initiative and responsibility. He realizes that failure to do his job will badly affect others whom he loves. In this environment work is a privilege, not a burden. Through work the farm boy or girl gains status. His own self-respect and esteem in the eyes of others stem directly from his willingness to do his job thoroughly and cheerfully. The character nurtured in such a milieu lessens delinquency during youth and is a preparation for good citizenship and religious loyalty in later years.

The father of a family on the land takes on the character of manhood with its physical strength, moral stamina and fatherly creativeness. His children see him at work, making decisions, solving problems, directing others, and acting like a true husbandman. This contrasts sharply with the experience of many urban and suburban children who never see their fathers at work, who picture them as rather helpless and indolent individuals who get in the way and interfere with mother's work on weekends and evenings.

The mother of a family on the farm becomes more motherly in her development and achievements. It is there that she blossoms out into her full womanhood. She brings to her family a greater realization of the dignity, sacredness and importance of motherhood.

[illegible]'s close relationship between family life and the land gives rise to a significant socio-economic institution — the family farm. The family farm is not merely a place to live. It certainly is not just a place to work. It represents a way of life. It is a bulwark of Christianity and democracy. Many persons presume that the family farm is relatively small. This is not necessarily true. The size of a family farm will vary according to the location and the type of crops produced. It may be a 5-acre truck farm in Delaware, a 100-acre dairy farm in Wisconsin, a 250-acre corn-hog farm in Iowa, a 2,000-acre wheat farm in Kansas, or a 10,000-acre ranch in Texas.

A family farm is one operated by a family for the support of that family. The family provides the managerial decisions and most of the labor. It depends upon the income of the farm for its livelihood. In other words, such a farming operation is a family enterprise. Very few such enterprises exist in urban areas today. There is, therefore, great significance in the fact that most American farms are still operated by and for the family. Consequently, economic and social forces should be weighed with a view to their bearing upon preservation of the family farm pattern.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TRENDS AFFECTING THE RURAL FAMILY --

Agriculture is now experiencing a revolution comparable to the industrial revolution of a century ago. Farming in America is being rapidly mechanized. During the period 1947 to 1954 the value of machines on farms doubled; the number of tractors increased from 2.2 million to 4.6 million, and the number of combines and corn pickers tripled. This means less tedious, manual labor and more leisure for farmers. It also has occasioned the increase of the size of farms and the consequent decrease in the number of farm families.

In 1940 the average size farm was 220 acres; in 1954 it was 336 acres. In 1949 farm population was 17.5 percent of the nation's population; in 1959 it was 12 percent. This means that there are fewer families enjoying the social, religious and cultural advantages of rural life.

It would be appropriate at this juncture to mention the 2½ million low income farm families whose lot is certainly not one of advantage. Theirs is a special problem, not within the scope of this paper. Mechanization and low prices for produce do not affect these families so much as the middle income farm families. Similarly, farm programs and private projects which aid middle income families do not substantially alter the plight of low income families. One of the organizations capable of assisting low income families is the Farmers Home Administration. We should urge a re-evaluation of the role of this agency.

Net farm income has declined in recent years while incomes of other groups have gone up and the cost of living has increased. In 1952, national farm income was $15.1 billion; in 1953, 13.3 billion; in 1954, 12.7 billion; in 1956, 11.6 billion, and in 1959, a new low of 10.3 billion: the U.S.D.A. forecasts still less income for 1960. This further accelerates the decrease in the numbers of farm families. It deprives some families of the economic security necessary for an optimum family life; it prompts members of such families to seek off-farm employment. In 1958, 28 percent of net income of farmers was derived from off-farm employment.

In recent years many nonfarm families have moved to rural communities. These families bring new ideas and values to these communities. Sometimes there is friction between the old and new residents, thus creating a less than ideal atmosphere for the persons involved.

The rapid adoption of television by rural families tends to make them less distinct culturally from urban families. (In 1959, 73 percent of farm hoves had television sets compared with 3 percent in 1950. In 1959, 86 percent of rural nonfarm homes had sets; 89 percent of urban homes were so equipped.) Television is a passive sort of recreation and contrasts sharply with the active recreation once prevalent among rural people.

Some less tangible but very significant changes are reported in Agriculture Information Bulletin No. 215 of the U.S.D.A., "Keeping Abreast of Change in the Rural Community." The following are among the changes listed: Many

functions formerly performed in the farm home are now being performed outside the home. Home life and work life are more separated than in the past. This is due in part to the increase in off-farm work by farmers and their wives, and in part to the mechanical nature of farm work. More of the rural family's recreational and social life is sought away from the home and even away from the local community. The pace of family living has increased tremendously. The result is less time for intra-family pursuits.

WAYS TO STRENGTHEN THE RURAL FAMILY —

This brief survey of trends affecting family life makes it obvious that these are times of significant changes and that most of these changes imperil some of the values traditionally associated with the rural family. Some of these trends can be offset at least partially.

Education and legislation might prevent unwarranted increase of the size of farm and the consequent lessening of numbers of farm families. We do not wish to maintain farm units too small for efficiency and too small to support adequately a family. There are, however, many studies to show that the middle-sized farm is most efficient. For example, Professor N. L. Mosher, College of Agriculture, University of Illinois, recently published studies which suggest that the two-man farm is the most efficient.

Even more important than the size of the farm is the preservation of the family farm as the basic socio-economic institution in the countryside. As the number of family farms decreases and the number of families merely employed on farms increases, many of the ideals of rural family life will be impaired. The National Catholic Rural Life Conference considers the preservation of the family farm one of its most important objectives. A number of public officials and leaders of farm organizations concur in this opinion and assist us to pursue this objective. Time does not permit a complete listing of the ways in which we are pursuing this objective.

Let us mention two public laws which we think are injurious to the family farm and which we urge to be repealed. Public Law 78 legalizes the importation of hundreds of thousands of low-paid agricultural workers from Mexico each year. Family farmers must compete with these under-paid workers. Secondly, we urge an end to the payment of unlimited subsidies to large farms. Subsidies can be justified only on the principle of distributive justice according to which assistance is to be given in proportion to the needs of the recipient and with a view to the effect of such assistance upon the common good. No single farmer has a rightful need for tens of thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money. Neither is the common good advanced by such unlimited subsidies which often enable wealthy farmers to increase their acreage at the expense of the operators of family farms.

Off-farm work might be helpful or harmful to family life. If the conditions of work and wages are inadequate, harm will result. If mothers of small children are attracted in large numbers to jobs outside the home, those children will be badly affected. We are aware of the fact that underemploy-

ment is one of the greatest economic problems of the American farm family, but we insist that the relocation of small industries in the countryside must be wisely planned. All too often these industries seek to employ women rather than men. They do not always promote the welfare of the family or community. This is a field in which church nad community leaders must take a hand. The National Catholic Rural Life Conference is now engaged in a large-scale study of these issues and will soon publish its findings.

Much could be done to assure farm families of a better income. Collective bargaining in the marketplace and cooperative purchasing of equipment are among the means for accomplishing this. Such cooperative undertaking will not be effective nor lasting unless those who participate are imbued with the ideology of cooperation. Most American farmers have drifted far from this ideology. A thorough educational program is needed. Many of you present at this conference are leaders of organizations which can and should assist in such a program.

Religious and community leaders must study ways better to integrate newcomers into the community and utilize their talents, thus creating an atmosphere conducive to better family living. The National Catholic Rural Life Conference has recently published two policy statements which relate to this task, namely: "The Non-Urban Parish" and "A Program for the Rural Community."

NEED FOR FAMILY EDUCATION —

The countryside still affords an environment conducive to sound family life but not in the same degree as in days-gone-by. We must labor to preserve these environmental bulwarks for wholesome family life. Our efforts, however, will not completely stay the forces which are reducing both rural and urban family life to a common level — a level of mediocrity in many of its phases. Hence, we can depend less upon traditions and environmental conditions to maintain the more desirable characteristics of the rural family. We must turn more toward **educational and inspirational programs.**

Young people cannot rely entirely upon their experience in their parental homes for preparation for their role as married people. Even that which the parents exemplify may be overlaid with many false attitudes derived from television shows, movies, novels, conversation, etc. Marriage preparation courses in our schools and conferences in our parishes fill a very great need. Churches should be especially active in this education undertaking. Religious and moral principles must be closely related to family ideals and policies. A secular educational agency can never adequately treat these ideals and policies. If we permit the home to be secularized, the last citadel of integrated Christian living will have perished.

The Roman Catholic Church provides pre-cana conferences for engaged couples. These are series of lectures treating the religious, medical, psychological, economic and sociological aspects of marriage. Married couples are urged to attend cana conferences in which their duties to each other, their children

and their community are stressed. Couples who attend these conferences are encouraged to join a family apostolate called the "Christian Family Movement". Six to ten couples belong to each CFM group. They meet bi-monthly to plan together ways and means to strengthen their ideals and to attack common problems.

CONCLUSION —

This sort of an educational program, together with the environmental influences of the countryside, should make possible a very vigorous and wholesome family life in 1965. The American Country Life Association includes in its membership leaders of the churches, farm organizations, governmental agencies and educational institutions. These are the leaders who have the privilege and responsibility to guide rural families toward this goal. The effectiveness of this leadership will determine in large part the quality of rural family life in 1965.

RURAL BELIEFS AND VALUES IN COUNTRY LIFE

JOHN M. BREWSTER, Agricultural Economist
United States Department of Agriculture
Agricultural Research Service
Farm Economics Research Division

For each 100 farms in 1940, there were only 75 in 1958, but in 1958, the average farm had 1.4 times as much land as in 1940 and produced products at nearly twice the value with only 46 percent as much labor. During the last decade the farm population has averaged a decline of more than 478,000 a year. Year after year, technical advance generates a large excess productive capacity, which is reflected in price-depressing surpluses.

Such astonishing rates of change prompt the theme that I would like to explore with you. This theme is threefold. Our machine age, including modern scientific agriculture, is the outgrowth of America's pre-machine creeds of life, both rural and urban. But the very technical advance that is thus the ripe fruit of our pre-machine creeds now throws them into conflict at many points. These conflicts are the heart of modern-day policy problems in agriculture and industry alike, although our present concern is with farm policy only.

In developing this theme, attention is centered on three questions. (1) What are the key judgments of value that have functioned as the chief guides to policy formation in America since early times? (2) What has been the role of these value beliefs in the shaping of farm policy? (3) In what major respects does rapid farm technological advance now generate conflicts among these values, thus creating the most serious policy problems in the history of rural America?

1. BASIC BELIEFS AND VALUES

In colonial times, when the expansion of the Old World into the New pushed past the outposts of the Atlantic seaboard, there began to emerge an American agriculture of predominantly family farms. This was the chief institution through which America conquered the wilderness.[1] It combined in the same individual or family the managerial and labor roles of life, which in the feudal past from which America developed were segregated into lord and serf.

A. **The Democratic Creed:** This enabled people in their workaday life to view and prize themselves as "equally kings", instead of "inferiors" and "superiors" as was the habit of their immediate past. To people with this imagery of themselves, no truths are so self-evident as the central premises of the democratic creed: (1) All men are of equal dignity and worth; and (2) none, however wise or good, is wise or good enough to be entitled to arbitrary power over any other. Thus the family farm played an important part in enabling the New World to make the transition from feudal to democratic

1-"In the main the Great West was conquered by individuals, or to speak more accurately, by families," Beard, Charles A. and Beard, Mary R. **"The Rise of American Civilization,"** New York: Macmillian Co., 930, p. 509.

ways of thought and practice under agrarian conditions. To this institution America is chiefly indebted for being at the same time the youngest of the great powers and the oldest of the democracies. The founders of the Republic stated that, while "the great experiment" had failed elsewhere, it had a real chance to succeed here because they could envision America for many years hence as primarily an agricultural society of predominantly family farms. For example, at the constitutional convention, Madison bluntly stated:

> "In future times a great majority of the people will not only be without land and other sort of property. These will either combine under the influence of their common situation; in which case the right of property and the public liberty will not be secure in their hands: or what is more probable, they will become the tools of opulence and ambition, in which case there will be equal danger from the other side."[2]

B. **The Work Ethic:** No less indigenous to the family farm than the democratic creed are two other sets of deep-seated beliefs and values that have guided policy formation since the founding of the Republic. The first of these may be called the ethic of industry, or more simply, the work ethic. Three component beliefs of this ethic are relevant here.

(1) The first is called the work-imperative: (a) Relative to persons, this imperative is the belief that one fails to deserve the esteem of self, family, country, and even all men if he places love of the "easy ways" above love of excellence in any useful employment of his choice. Superior industry is thus made the test of the merited status — the dignity, approbation, and esteem — that each self covets in the eyes of all observers including his own. (b) In respect to organizations, the work-imperative is the judgment that no institution, even the family farm, deserves acceptance and esteem unless it can equal or excel others in performing a given social function, such as feeding and clothing the world. (c) With respect to the Nation, it is the judgment that a country fails to deserve high standing if, for example, it endangers the well-being of future generations by wasting its soil and other resources or if it jeopardizes its security by producing unimportant private goods at the expense of much needed public goods, such as education, defense, health, and the like.

With the so-called materialistic income incentive embedded in the belief in superior industry as the proper test of merit, the drive that leads the farmer in a ceaseless quest for new cost-reducing and output-increasing technologies is not merely love of money but aversion to ways of life that deserve disesteem. Because he shares this belief, few things get on his nerves more than the preaching of "ideals" that have no promise and such materialistic outcomes as disease conquered, scrub stock bred into fine herds, or the secrets of photosynthesis unlocked. For the mandates of his belief neither permit him to live by bread alone nor to accept poetic pieties as a substitute for bread. It prevents him from dividing his life into a sphere of idealism on the one hand, and a

[2] Documents illustrative of the Formation of the Union, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1927, pp. 489-90.

sphere of materialismon the other. Instead, it prompts him to weave the more humane aspirations of the race into a forward march of material progress. It makes him, in short, a practical idealist, striving ceaselessly for greater abundance of both material welfare and treasures of the spirit alike.

(2) At an early stage in American lore, the ethic of industry came to include the optimistic judgment that, in their creative potential, men and nations alike possess ample means of closing the gap, as it were, between their present circumstances and their aspirations. According to their faith, human capacities are sufficient to improve the lot of the common man, without limit. To believe less puts a ceiling on the American dream and belittles the promise of American life. Thus the ethic of industry is a wellspring of hope and confidence in a brighter future for all.

(3) Finally, in its judgment that proficiency in any employment of one's choice is the proper test of status deserts, the ethic of industry obviously includes a unique concept of justice. This concept is expressed in the judgment that society owes to each man (a) the equivalent of his contributions and (b) equal access to the necessary means of developing his creative potential to the fullest extent possible. The first of these is called commutative justice; the second is the justice of equal opportunity, sometimes called distributive justice.

C. **The Enterprise Creed:** As deeply rooted in American agriculture as the Democratic creed and ethic of industry is a third set of value judgments that comprise the enterprise creed. Two of these are relevant here: (1) Proprietors or their legal agents deserve exclusive right (power) to prescribe the rules for their production units; (2) therefore, a prime function of government is to prevent anyone, including the government itself, from encroaching upon the managerial power of proprietors to run their businesses as they please. In an agriculture of family farms, everyday experience lends unusual support to these deep-seated enterprise beliefs. For, under this circumstance, the individual's thrift and industry takes the form of land, equipment, and other forms of capital accumulation with which he works. Thus in great measure, the farm becomes the extension of the farmer's personality; hence to interfere with the proprietary power of the operators to run their farms or businesses as they please is to rob them of the right to be free.

Thus to be free is to be left alone, unmolested by collective restraints on the managerial power of proprietors. In contrast, the meaning of freedom implicit in the democratic creed is not the absence of collective restraints on individual action but the right (or power) of each individual to an equal voice in shaping whatever common rules are believed necessary for the general welfare. Much confusion arises from the failure to distinguish between the positive meanings of freedom in the democratic creed and the negative or laissez faire sense of freedom inherent in our enterprise creed. This confusion drags virtually the whole American heritage under the skirts of the enterprise creed and uses it to bolster laissez faire policy views on the ground that opposite policies threaten our democratic way of life.

2. ROLE OF BELIEFS AND VALUES IN FARM POLICY FORMATION

These central value judgments of the democratic creed, the ethic of industry and the enterprise creed, have long nourished in farm people the prized image of themselves as the complete masters of themselves and their farms, seeking nothing of anyone including government, but an even chance to stand on their own feet and share equitably with the rest of the Nation in the benefits of their increasingly superior industry. But they do seek that. They have done so under the presupposition that all their basic creeds would be fulfilled if only government lived up to their work ethic concept of equity by extending to farmers equality of productive opportunities, on the one hand, and equality of income opportunities on the other. There has never been the slightest suspicion that fulfillment of this sense of justice inherent in our work ethic might require considerable sacrifice of the desire for the negative freedom inherent in our enterprise creed. Let us highlight the role of this presupposition in farm policy formation.

1. **The struggle for equality of productive opportunities:** Struggle for equality of productive opportunities dominated the rural scene from the formation of the Republic until the 1920's. Three phases of this struggle deserve mention.

(a) Until the Civil War, the prime objective was to persuade society to adopt national land policies and programs that would enable the working farmer with little or no cash to have the same opportunity as big speculators and others to acquire a piece of wild land which he and his family could convert into a productive farm. No one more accurately caught up the spirit of this quest for equality of opportunity than did Thomas Hart Benton in the great farm policy debate of the 1840's. Said he:

> "Tenancy is unfavorable to freedom. It lays the foundation for separate orders in society, annihilates the love of country, and weakens the spirit of independence. The farming tenant has, in fact, no country, no hearth, no domestic altar, no household god. The freeholder, on the contrary, is the natural supporter of a free government; and it should be the policy of monarchies to multiply tenants. We are a republic, and we wish to continue so; then multiply the class of freeholders; pass the public lands cheaply and easily into the hands of the people; sell, for a reasonable price, to those who are able to pay; and give, without price, to those who are not. I say give, without price, to those who are not able to pay; and that which is so given, I consider as sold for the best of prices; for a price above gold and silver; a price which cannot be carried away by delinquent officers, nor lost in the failing banks, nor stolen by thieves; nor squandered by an improvident and extravagant administration. It brings a price above rubies — a race of virtuous and independent laborers, the true supporters of their country and the stock from which its best defenders must be drawn."[3]

[3] From a speech by Thomas Hart Benton found in his **Thirty Years Review**. A History of the Working of the American Government for Thirty Years, from 1820 to 1850, Vol. 1, ch. IV, pp. 11-12.

50

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This struggle culminated in the Homestead Act of 1862, which offered free simple ownership of a quarter-section to anyone willing to spend three years in transforming it into a home and a farm. Through such national land policies, an agriculture of predominantly family farms sank its roots in American soil.

(b) But no sooner did farmers thus succeed in achieving equal opportunity to rights in the land than they realized that, unlike big businesses, they could not provide themselves with the technical knowledge that was needed to fulfill their aspirations for a better life through superior industry. To this end, throughout the next half-century (1860-1914), they sought to persuade society to establish agricultural research and educational institutions that would make available to them the specialized knowledge they needed to develop their productive potential:

> "With the passage of the Morrill Act in 1862, there began emerging a government that increasingly undertook responsibility for supplying farmers with the practical knowledge needed to develop their productive potential to the fullest extent possible. In the history of the Republic, there is no finer chapter than that on how the Nation's effort to meet this need began with little more than a sprawling farm on which some experienced farmer instructed young men in the best-known farm practices of his time, and within the short span of a century unfolded into the modern system of Land Grant Colleges, Experiment Stations, and Extension Services that is today the wonder of the world."[4]

(c) But as quickly as they thus (farmers) achieved equality of opportunity in technical education, farmers found themselves up against another inequality of opportunity, the lack of access to ample capital loans on the same reasonable terms that private lending institutions made available to nonfarm businesses.[5] They sought remedy through a government that would equalize capital loan opportunities for farmers by setting up needed agricultural credit institutions. In due course, society met this request with the establishment of the Federal Land Banks, the Bank for Cooperatives, the Farmers Home Administration, and the Rural Electrification Administration.

2. **The struggle for equality of income opportunities**: Underlying all of these policies was the presupposition that if through government society extended to farmers an equality of productive opportunities, agriculture would automatically share equitably with society the benefits of its cost-reducing and output-increasing technologies. All that was needed to pull agriculture out of its relatively low income position was to enable farmers to becomec inreasingly more efficient producers.

4-Brewster, John M., "The Impact of Technical Advance and Migration on Agricultural Society and Policy," Journal of Farm Economics, Dec. 1959, p. 1176.

5-These loan opportunities were not available to farmers from private lending institutions, which grew up in response to the large-volume long-term investment and quick turnover production credit needs of big-scale business.

But this belief was vulnerable in two respects. (1) Total demand for food and fiber is highly inelastic; that is a given percentage change in the total supply of farm products, relative to a given aggregate demand, is associated with an appreciably larger percentage change in the level of farm prices. For example, a 4 or 5 percent increase in aggregate supply of food, relative to the same demand, may result in a decline in farm prices as much as 20 percent.[6] (2) Because fixed costs make up a high percentage of total farm cost, the total supply of farm products is also highly inelastic. This means that if the level of farm prices falls, the survival of the individual farmer lies in striving to offset his loss of income from lower prices by producing a larger output. But when most farmers do this, they make the siatuation worse than before.

Thus agriculture can at the same time be increasingly productive and yet afflicted indefinitely with relatively low incomes, even if the general economy is characterized by high levels of employment, but which are not high enough to provide new jobs for all of the natural increase in the labor force, for those displaced by technical advances of a labor-saving nature, and for a sufficient reduction in the farm population to remove agriculture's excess capacity. Under this circumstance, as a result of its very quest for rapid technical advance, agriculture may become the victim of a cost-price squeeze that drains off to the rest of society the major benefits of its rapid technical advance. Except for the extraordinary demand for farm products and labor that was generated by World War II, farmers have been caught in such a squeeze since the 1920's. As the squeeze began, farmers sought to persuade society through government to provide institutions that would enable agriculture to stabilize its production at reasonable prices. To implement this desire, a parity formula was worked out to indicate the prices that would give farm products generally the same per unit purchasing power in terms of goods and services used in both production and farm family living as prevailed in the based period 1910-14.

Various price-support programs have been established to implement this concept of equity for agriculture. These programs include provisions for (1) acreage allotments and price supports at certain percentages of parity prices on cotton, tobacco, wheat, peanuts, and soybeans; (2) taking land out of production and putting it into a soil conservation reserve; and (3) marketing agreements that enable farmers in a given geographic area, such as the New York milkshed, to fix prices for different uses of a product such as milk and to determine how much of the product can be sold at premium prices. Provisions are made also for direct government purchase of perishables. When the output of price-supported commodities is too great to clear the market at support prices, provisions are made for government acquisitions of the surplus, either through the device of non-recourse loans for storable products or through direct purchase of perishables. To dispose of such surpluses, programs have been established for expanding consumption. These include direct distribution to welfare clients and public school lunches. Similar distributions

6-Daly, Rex F., "Demand for Farm Products at Retail and Farm Level: Some Empirical Measurements and Related Problems." Journal of the American Statistical Association, Sept. 1958, pp. 667-8.

may be made to friendly foreign countries through private agencies, such as CARE. Provisions are made for selling surpluses to friendly foreign countries in exchange for foreign currencies to be used for economic development projects in the recipient countries. Provisions are made also for bartering surpluses with foreign countries in exchange for strategic material (such as industrial diamonds), and for finding new uses of farm products through utilization-research programs, both at home and abroad.

3. **The presupposition of present programs:** These income-support programs do not constitute a system of comprehensive supply controls designed to prevent an excess of aggregate productive capacity from generating price-depressing surpluses year after year. On the contrary, the presumption underlying their design was that while they are needed to protect farmers from the downswings of the business cycle, they would become largely inoperative in the upswing.[7] During the 1930's, for example, their rationale was that of an "ever-normal granary."[8] The thought was that if a series of good years produced bumper wheat crops, for example, depressed incomes to wheat farmers could be prevented through wheat acreage allotments that would act to divert land from wheat to other uses and through storing surplus wheat in the good years and releasing it in lean years. In this way, wheat prices would be stabilized at equitable levels for farmers, and the public would be assured an abundance of wheat at reasonable prices in lean as well as bumper years.

Owing to the demand generated in the World War II period, the progress became inoperative as market prices for all farm products rose above support-price levels. In line with this fact, the programs were retained upon the close of the war on the old idea that they were necessary as a means of protecting farm prices against any downswings of the business cycle, and that they would become largely inoperative in the upswings. Thus in the 1940's, as in the depressed 1930's, the belief was that, if given continuously high levels of employment, the price-support programs could be laid on the shelf and kept there except when needed as protection against the inequities of temporary emergencies.

4. **The crisis of abundance:** The experience of the 1950's cast serious doubt on the validity of this belief. The decade witnessed an agriculture with a worsening income position and rapid technological advance in a national economy with unprecedented peace-time high levels of employment. The facts are these. From 1949 through 1958, the national economy was characterized by an average increase in total output of 4 percent a year.[9] During

[7] See statement of Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, Longer-Range Agricultural Policy, Hearings before the Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, U.S. Govt. Printing Office, Part 1, April 21, 22 and 23, 1947, pp. 8-9. Also statement of Carl C. Furrington, Asst. Administrator of Productions Marketing Administration, Hearing before same House Committee, October 6, 7, and 8, 1947, pp. 150-153; 162-163; 172-173.

[8] Wallace, Henry A., "Definition of the Ever-Normal Granary," **The Agricultural Situation,** March 1937, p. 9.

[9] "Survey of Current Business," U.S. Department of Commerce, July 1959, Table1-2, pp. 6-7.

this decade, farm population declined an average of more than 478,000 persons, or 1.8 percent, annually.[10] At the close (1958) of the decade, 48 percent of the farm families fell within the lowest 20 percent of the income distribution for all U.S. families. This compared with 39 percent of farm families falling within the lowest income fifth of all families in 1947. In 1946 and 1957, which were somewhat less favorable farm-income years than 1947 and 1958, 41 and 55 percent, respectively, of all farm families were in the lowest income fifth.[11]. Again in the 1946-47 period, the average income of farm families from all sources including perquisites was approximately 73 percent as large as that of non-farm families. But it ranged from only 55 to 59 percent as large during the 1955-57 period, the latest years for which data are available.

Although agriculture's income position was thus worsening, farm output increased at an annual rate of about 2.2 percent,[12] as compared with an average of only 1.7 percent in the total population, the chief source of additional markets for farm products. So rapid has been the rate of technical advance that farm output averaged 8 percent more than domestic consumption needs from 1949 through 1956, the latest year for which estimates have been made.[13] No letup to this excess production is in easy sight. For even if technical inventions in agriculture were to come to a dead halt, it is estimated that the demands for food and fiber of our 1975 population could be met through full use of presently available farm technologies.[14] Meanwhile, there is no evidence that the rate of technical inventions will not proceed as rapidly in the decade ahead as in the past.

Thus the lesson of the 1950's is clear. For a long time to come, even the currently high employment levels and rapid growth rates of the national economy will not be nearly enough, either to generate sufficient demand for farm products or to provide the amount of nonfarm employment opportunities that will permit the extent of outfarm migration needed to relieve agriculture of its large excess productive capacity. No marked increase in the employment levels and growth rates of the last decade are foreseen in the decade ahead. Thus agriculture seems to be caught in a cost-price squeeze that will continue as in the past to siphon off to the rest of society the major benefits of its rapid output-increasing and cost-reducing technologies, thus leaving farmers the lowest paid of any major occupational group.

10-Farm Income Situation, U.S. Agricultural Marketing Service, July 1959, Table 6, figures for 1959 preliminary.

11-Calculations based on income-distribution data contained in the April 1960 Survey of Current Business and in a supplement to the Survey of Current Business, Income Distribution in the United States, Office of Business Economics, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1953.

12-Agricultural Outlook Charts, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Nov. 1959, p. 4.

13-Bonnen, James T., "American Agriculture in 1965," in Joint Committee Print, 85th Congress, First Session, Policy for Commercial Agriculture, Table 1, p. 147, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., Nov. 22, 1957.

14-Barton, G. T. and Daly, R. F., "Prospects for Agriculture in a Growing Economy, Problems and Policies of American Agriculture," Iowa State University Press, 1959.

3. DEEP-SEATED VALUE CONFLICTS

In this way, the very technical advance long called for by the belief of farm people in superior industry as a proper way of meriting an ever-higher social and economic position in life, now throws into serious conflict their deep-seated work ethic and enterprise beliefs. For, in generating price-depressing surpluses year after year, it prevents them from sharing equitably in the benefits of their increasingly superior industry. The more they practice the ethic of industry, the more the market subjects them to a continuing lower income-position than that enjoyed by nonfarm people. A frequently suggested remedy is a program of comprehensive supply controls, commodity by commodity, that would limit aggregate farm output to optimum levels from the standpoint of the public and farm people alike. Farmers tend to want such a program as a means of liberating themselves from a market that violates their work ethic sense of justice by denying them the privilege of sharing equitably with the rest of the economy in the cost-reducing benefits of their increasingly superior industry. But the price of this liberation is collective constraints on the right of proprietors to run their businesses as they please. Therefore, they tend to resist on the ground that such constraints are wrong.

Thus the farmer's technology puts his conscience in a jam. At issue is not a question of the democratic freedom of each to have an equal voice in laying down the rules which all must observe for the sake of the common good; the issue is the kind of malady from which the farmer most seeks liberation. Does he most prize a democratic order that restrains him from farming as he pleases in order to free him from being deprived of an equitable share of the benefits of his increasingly superior industry? Or does he most want a democratic order that subjects him to this injustice but leaves undisturbed his proprietary power to farm as he pleases? Either choice is consistant with our democratic creed. Thus the value conflict that is generated by our highly productive farm technology and limited markets is strictly a clash between the deep-seated love of commutative and distributive justice, inherent in our work ethic, and the equally deep-seated love of unfettered proprietary (or managerial) power inherent in our enterprise creed. The means to either value is thus some undesirable sacrifice of the other.

4. CONCLUSION

In making up their minds on farm and other policy issues today, it might be of help to farm people if, in addition to indispensable charts and figures on cost-price consequences of the alternative policy choices, they had also at least three nonquantitative factors before the mind's eye: These are (a) clean-cut identifications of the key value judgments that have long functioned as the chief guides to our policy formation; (b) a clear picture of the salient premachine conditions that generated these premachine creeds of life; and finally (c) a clear picture of the spcific respect in which the Machine Age now throws our premachine creed into conflict at many points, thereby generating serious policy issues. Although such items of information are nonquantitative, they are no less relevant to policy deliberations than the how manys and the how muches.

A COLLATERAL REPORT
OF THE FIVE DISCUSSION GROUPS

Topic of Discussion: Significance to the local community of the declining number of farms and corresponding increase in size of farm operations.

The declining number of farms and corresponding increase in size of farm operations is one of the important factors in changing the character of the rural community.

I. Farming —

There are many regional differences in the way change affects farming as an industry. While in some areas the farm population is decreasing, in others close to industrial areas, the population is increasing. Here part-time farming becomes important. In some cases farm people have turned from full-time farming to part-time farming. In other cases town people are going into part-time farming. In addition we have residents who are neither part-time farmers nor farmers.

Industry is moving into North Carolina, thereby helping to keep rural people in the rural areas. The change from small to large farms has been most pronounced in eastern Kentucky. Many small, part-time farm units are being absorbed into large units with the original part-time operators moving into the city. In the dairy belt of Virginia small farms are merging into larger units. As a result we have a better utilization of equipment but also a greater demand for capital. In part of Minnesota the soil bank program is taking many entire units out of production. A conglomeration of change is taking place in Michigan. Markets have become regional instead of local. Seasonal labor is in demand with the result that we have many temporary rural residents. In Missouri most rural areas are losing population. In Wisconsin predominantly rural areas are losing population as the trend toward larger farm units continues. Small dairy plants are merging into larger, more efficient and more serviceable units.

Changes in transportation, improvements in highways and communications, as well as agricultural mechanization have been vital factors in bringing about these changes in the community structure. Too often there has been a tendency to accept change on a hit and miss basis rather than making effort to coordinate, utilize and mobilize services and know-how so as to give better direction to change. Every effort should be made to see the whole problem. When only one phase of the problem is met, other phases of the problem become intensified.

II. Living Patterns —

Decline in the number of farm units has also brought about change in the living patterns of people. The image of the family farmer remains strong

in the minds of farm people. Individuals are making a real effort to safeguard their freedom in decision-making in the area of farm business, in the community, and in rural-urban relationships. Individual farmers are getting further removed from the services both in leadership and in distance from the service. For example, farm cooperatives are getting larger, the same as the family farm. The farmer must have a cooperative that can bring him service on a competitive basis with big business.

The advance of technology has resulted in a more impersonal relationship between the individual and his school, his church, or other organizations. As services get bigger and bigger he has only a business or informal contact with these services and less opportunity to participate in their leadership.

Informal aid which once played a very significant role in the farm community is disappearing. Informal cooperation which once was primary in the farm community is being supplanted by more formal cooperation, particularly in the area of buying and selling.

As farmers have modernized their farm operations so the farmer's home has also been modernized and the farm family is enjoying many more modern conveniences. Even though the farm kitchen is equipped with many new appliances there is less production for home consumption in the way of canning of garden products. The farmer's wife visits the supermarket and makes generous use of frozen foods. This to a large part can be traced to the fact that urban values and standards have had a significant impact upon farm patterns of living.

The trend is toward participation in larger groups. This has affected leadership. For example, when there are a dozen local rural schools many more people are given the opportunity of serving on school boards. With the consolidation of rural schools fewer people are serving on school boards.

There has been a general trend in merging of rural and urban activities. Home Demonstration Clubs and 4-H Clubs, once solely farm activities, are now open to the entire community. Farm organizations and farm cooperatives have members who are from the community but not engaged in farming.

III. Community Institutions —

The decline of the number of farm units and the corresponding increase in the sizes of farms and the resultant change in the composition of the town and country community population has had significant influence in the community institutions.

It has hastened the reorganization and the consolidation of **schools.** The curriculum of the schools had to be broadened to meet the educational needs of the new community.

The **church** has greatly felt the affects of these social and economic changes. In many communities it has been a struggle to maintain the open country church. It has made necessary the consolidating of congregations so that it would be possible to provide the necessary leadership facilities, with

well-equipped classrooms, and a broader program of church activities.

Cooperatives have been forced to rethink the participation pattern of their members, the benefits that they provide to their members, and the development of equitable treatment of large and small cooperators. Cooperatives are putting more emphasis on the quality of their products. The intermingling of rural and city people in the emerging community makes it more difficult for the cooperatives actively to involve their membership in the cooperative movement. More and more emphasis will need to be placed upon the educational aspect of their program.

Farm organizations have definitely felt the impact of the decline in the number of farmers. They find it increasingly more difficult to get members. Their expanded programs have made it necessary to increase their membership fees. Serving communities in which they have big farm operators and part-time farmers, they find it necessary to re-examine their objectives and policies. With the decline in the number of farm people, farm organizations need to expand their public relations program. Where once they could rely upon the influence of the farm vote, they now have to interpret effectively the farm situation to the total public.

In the past the farm organizations have been built largely around the farm family but they are discovering that the family approach is becoming ever more difficult and this increases their problem of getting good attendance at their meetings. They find it necessary to build good relations between rural and urban and town and country in order that they may have the intelligent understanding of the nonfarm people living in their community.

Government needs to re-examine its entire local and county structure and modify it in terms of the changing circumstances so that it may more adequately serve the people in the new community.

IV. Community Problems —

Persons working in rural communities, churches, schools and extension service have a real challenge to meet. Many of them need additional in-service training to be better qualified to tackle the jobs of dealing with the changing character of the rural community. The church, for example, needs a larger in-service training program for its ministers.

We have the constant problem of helping new people become adjusted to the community. The groups listed the following problems:

1. Growing lack of cohesiveness on a community basis.

2. Lack of education in basic academic concepts as well as in health, citizenship, and socio-economic trends.

3. Lack of home training and the need for building sounder sense of values within the family.

4. Too much dependence on few leaders, while not recognizing the need for developing more and better rural leaders.

5. A tendency to stigmitize people within a rural community according to religion, trading area, and commodity interest.

6. Failure to utilize the services and agencies that are available.

7. Inadequate use of communications, coupled with the need for broadening the scope of information in regard to the community trends.

8. Failure to provide off farm employment, full or part-time, to an extent that is reasonably possible and desirable.

9. The expansion of communities by the influx of population usually, temporarily at least, leaves the political and institutional control of the enlarged communities in the hands of the dominant remnants of the social and economic elite. This situation more often than not makes political and institutional reforms and reorientations difficult to achieve. The newcomers find it slow and difficult to become political and institution participants in community life.

10. Many of the new or extended communities are really no more than bedrooms for people who are employed in adjacent metropolitan areas. Such communities present difficult problems in establishing cohesive community life and adequate community institutions.

11. The movement of the farm population has not only created the problems of new or expanded communities, but has often left a dearth of economic, social, or political leadership in the rural communities from which population has migrated.

12. The population movement has been accompanied by an increase in the size of farms, many of which are commercial in character as contrasted with the family-size farm and are highly mechanized. There has been a constantly decreasing demand for manpower in farming. The manpower need now is for the skilled and specialized types. Farm labor has been rapidly displaced.

13. One result of the displacement of farm labor has been the turning of many families into the stream of migratory labor. The results of this situation are well known, but too often ignored. Low wages, periods of unemployment, insanitary living conditions, poor housing, inadequate medical and health services, poor school attendance and poor instruction, and the lack of many of the benefits and child and maternal welfare are the lot of the migrants.

V. Needs —

1. Public law should provide for the zoning of rural and open-country areas. Zoning should control the location of residential areas, housing standards, recreation areas, commercial areas, industrial locations, and especially zoning and licensing regulations should control the location and operation of commercial recreational establishments.

2. There should be strict regulation to eliminate the littering of highways. The growing menace and unsightliness of empty beer cans and broken whisky and beer bottles along our highways is a disgrace.

3. Rural areas and villages are in need of more appropriate and expanded recreational facilities and activities. Professional direction and supervision are especially needed.

4. Rural landscapes should be preserved and beautified. The obstruction of views by advertising signs and billboards should be forbidden and the cluttering of our highways with such matter should be strictly regulated.

5. There is great need for new and expanded health services for rural areas. More hospitals, clinics, and public health personnel are needed, especially for the most rural areas.

6. There is need for a vast expansion in public library services. Many states should make much better use of available Federal funds for rural library service than is now the case. Additional Federal funds for this purpose are going to be needed.

7. Organizations such as Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Campfire Girls, YMCA, YWCA, and 4-H Clubs should expand their services and programs to reach larger numbers of rural-farm youth. In this respect it is especially important to note that the need for additional 4-H Club leaders is in the 1,100 or 1,200 most rural counties. Increased financial support for this service is needed from the Federal Government without respect to state and local matching of funds.

8. Radical changes are needed in residence requirements, eligibility for voting and other citizenship restrictions. The time lag in the responsiveness of local government to social, economic, and political needs is altogether too great.

9. The increased need for the reorganization of school districts and the consolidation of schools is so obvious that there is scarcely room for agreement in behalf of such action. For the most part the greatest need is for the consolidation of small high schools.

10. Improvement is needed in the use people make of the leisure time which is becoming available to them in increasing amounts. An important aspect thereof should be healthy, intellectual curiosity that seeks satisfaction through adult education in various forms.

11. Better use of the talents of our senior or older citizens — the grandparents set — is badly needed.

12. Need for outside capital to provide more constructively for the transition from small to large farm units.

VI. Suggestions —

A. General:

It was recommended that young adults in their 30's and 40's be given more opportunity for leadership. Often in rural communities older leadership is so entrenched that they keep their position until they are 60 or 70. The new rural community must be more adaptable than this.

B. Education:

1. Education as a basic academic concept should be improved.
2. Young people should be helped to know of available career opportunities.
3. Training should be provided for diverse life needs.
4. School district reorganization should be extended.
5. Rural library service must be enhanced.

6. Churches should help meet the educational challenge involving youth, family relations, citizens, etc.

7. Agricultural extension services can do more to help youth appreciate rural life opportunities and help them better to understand their communities and requirements of citizenship.

8. Homemaker groups should become a greater force in the field of adult education.

9. During the school reorganization process consideration might be given to retaining local schools as attendance units for younger children, provided facilities merit continued use and provided the school is favorably located with a sufficient number of children in the area.

10. Greater consideration should be given to provide recreation centers on a community basis.

11. Extension and adult education for full-time farmers should be continued but more consideration needs to be given to the part-time farmers and rural residents who are becoming the larger group in the areas.

12. Vocational education in rural schools must shift increasingly toward the nonfarm pursuits, while continuing to teach agricultural subjects.

13. Federal aid to education is badly needed.

14. There is need for more informal adult education.

a. Expansion of noncredit general interest courses is needed.

b. Some formal course work slanted toward the mature adult student is needed.

c. The many new rural agencies: SCS, FHA, Federal Farm Loan Boards, REA, etc. could and should make a greater educational contribution in the process of discharging their respective function.

d. A way of reaching and teaching people that have been largely ignored is to work through the existing business agencies dealing with farmers — fertilizer dealers, feed dealers, implement dealers, etc.

15. The rural church must adapt itself to the changing background of its constituents and their new problems.

16. Development of a broad community education program is needed.

C. Farm organizations and cooperatives:

1. Should play a more significant role in helping to meet the challenge of the changing rural community.

2. Need to help develop a sense of community cohesiveness.

3. Should make their local and annual meetings a family affair, including wives and children.

4. Need to create a sense of common interest in a marketing area.

5. Should strive to build a social consciousness among their members.

D. Rural Life Councils:

1. Such councils should be established in rural areas and should include lay and professional leaders.

2. They should embrace representatives of farm organizations, agricultural cooperatives, church groups, schools, homemaker groups, civic, industrial,

and any other related groups.

3. They should work to extend the concept of the inter-related rural community.

4. They should act as a planning group and carry on informational programs at various neighborhood levels.

E. Community Development:

1. Development of a broad community educational program.
2. Emphasis on community planning and development.
3. Re-evaluation of the place of government in our lives.

Conclusion —

It was recognized that many people resent change but often the integration of the new element can result in a greatly improved community. Using leadership resources of new people who come in has many advantages. A well-organized and a planned approach to understand change and how desirable changes can be brought about will do much to develop a cooperative spirit between the new and the old citizens in the community and help build the desirable community that meets the needs of the newcomers as well as the former residents in the community.

CITATION TO MILBURN LINCOLN WILSON

Born on a farm near Atlantic, Iowa, 1885, he received his B.S. degree in Agriculture at Iowa State College and his M.S. in Agricultural Economics from the University of Wisconsin. He pursued further graduate studies at the University of Chicago, and has been honored with doctorate degrees from Montana State College, 1935; North Dakota Agricultural College, 1940; and from the University of Rhode Island, 1952. He received the National Adult Education Award in 1946, and the Distinguished Service Award of the U.S. Department of Agriculture in 1947. Upon completing an educational advisory mission in Greece in 1948, he was named an honorary professor of the College of Agriculture at Athens, and in 1951, while in Italy, he was made an associate member of the Academy of Georgofili in Florence. He is a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science; American Farm Economics Society; Phi Kappa Phi; Epsilon Sigma Phi; Alpha Zeta; Unitarian Club, and the Cosmos Club of Washington, D.C.

M. L. Wilson started his professional agricultural career in 1912 as one of the first two county extension agents employed in Montana. He progressed through the ranks as county agent leader, farm management specialist, and head of the department of Agricultural Economics at Montana State College. He filled on interim appointment in the U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1924-26, as head of the Division of Farm Management and Costs. He returned to Montana but was again recalled to Washington when the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 was passed and became the first Wheat Production Administrator. Subsequently, he established and administered the Subsistence Homesteads Division of the Interior Department and then returned to the Department of Agriculture in 1934 as Assistant Secretary and later, Under Secretary of Agriculture.

Always his abiding interest is connected with humanitarian-type programs which serve agriculture and rural families. M. L. was extremely persevering in the problems of human nutrition. He took an active part in the President's National Nutrition program and directed the nation-wide wartime nutrition education work. He was chairman of the joint committee of officers of the Land-Grant College Association and the Department of Agriculture, appointed in December 1936 to formulate principles of relationship between the federal and State Agencies.

On February 1, 1940, he became Director of the Cooperative Extension Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. He served in this important position throughout World War II, giving strong educational leadership to the "Feed A Fighter" program, the farm labor program, improvement of agricultural technology, and the expansion and development of 4-H and other youth programs. He was one of three incorporators of the National 4-H Club Foundation of America, Inc., in 1948, and inspired the International Farm Youth Exchange Program.

As Cooperative Extension director, he worked continuously to strengthen

the working relationships among research, extension, farm organizations, and commodity groups. He has encouraged the more active participation of farm families in the formulation of educational policies and endeavors. He stimulated and encouraged research in extension methods and training, as well as in the cultural and social sciences.

He has served on numerous national and international boards, commissions, and advisory groups. He was a leader in the establishment of the Food and Agricultural organization which pre-dated but later became a part of the United Nations structure. He has traveled widely throughout the world. Since retirement from active government duty in 1953, Mr. Wilson has served as a consultant for the overseas program of the Ford Foundation. Two of his notable contributions include establishment of the comparative education curriculum at Cornell University, with the help of a Ford Foundation grant, and his Extension education advisory and consultative work with the Ford Foundation program in India, Pakistan, and other underdeveloped areas.

He served the American Country Life Association as president in 1936.

His friends and associates characterize M. L. as a great humanitarian, a tireless worker, a man of letters, dreams and plans, as well as a sincere, dedicated, and devoted friend of rural people everywhere.

In behalf of the American Country Life Association, this citation is conferred upon Milburn Lincoln Wilson, U.S. Department of Agriculture retired, for a half-century of outstanding and meritorious service to rural families throughout the world; for contributing uniquely to the educational facilities, institutions, opportunities, and programs which enhance the educational growth and development of rural people; for the encouragement of the economic, social, and spiritual status of families in the United States and underdeveloped countries throughout the world and for stimulation and encouragement of individual initiative and resourcefulness among rural people through the agricultural, home economics, and 4-H Club programs of the Cooperative Extension Service.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CITATION TO HOWARD A. DAWSON

Howard Athalone Dawson was born and grew up in Arkansas, the son of S. T. Claudius and Nellie Howard Dawson, both of whom spent lifetimes as public school teachers. After graduation from the Arkadelphia High School, he attended Henderson-Brown College and later took BS, MA, and PhD degrees at George Peabody College for Teachers in Nashville. In the interim he had taught in rural schools and served as local superintendent of schools in Arkansas.

Following graduation from Peabody in 1926, he became director of research for the Arkansas State Department of Education where he served until 1934. From 1934 to 1935, as consultant in school finance and administration to the Commissioner of Education, U.S. Office of Education, he organized a research project on reorganization of local school districts in ten states and directed a Federal Emergency Relief Program for Rural Schools.

In 1935, in response to a long effort to establish an "interpreter of rural education" at National Education Association headquarters, he became Assistant Director of the NEA Research Division, with responsibility in the field of rural education. On January 1, 1936, the Division of Rural Service of the NEA was established and he became its first, and, to this date, only director. During the years 1936-44 he also served as Secretary of the NEA Legislative Commission, in which capacity he played a significant role in the long struggle to secure adequate Federal support of public education.

Dr. Dawson has taught or given special lectures in colleges and universities in 12 or more states and the Graduate School of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Survey work which he has directed at county, city, and state levels has resulted in great advancement in the effective organization and support of public schools throughout the nation.

He has served as president of the Arkansas Education Association and of the National Association of State Directors of Educational Research, and was a member of the National Conference on the Emergency in School Finance in 1933. He was co-chairman of the National Commission on the Reorganization of School Districts, 1946-48, co-chairman of the First White House Conference on Rural Education in 1944, and chairman of the National Conference in 1954. He served as Consultant on Educational Organization for the President's Committee for the White House Conference on Education in 1955, and was active in the 1940, 1950, and 1960 White House Conferences on Children and Youth. on Rural Education in 1954. He served as Consultant on Educational Organization for the President's Committee for the White House Conference on Education in 1955, and was active in the 1940, 1950, and 1960 White House Conferences on Children and Youth.

Howard Dawson has been actively concerned with the welfare and education of disadvantaged children and has worked for this cause through the presidency of the Alliance for the Guidance of Rural Youth since 1946; the chairmanship, since 1953, of the National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor, of the Research Board on Education of Children of Migratory Agricultural Laborers since 1952, and currently of the Program Committee of the Board of Directors, Save-the-Children Federation.

Dr. Dawson is perhaps best known for his work in reorganization of local school units in rural areas. His book, **Satisfactory Local School Units,** is recognized as a foremost authoritative work in this field. He is joint author of **Your School District** (report of the National Commission on School District Reorganization), and joint author with Dr. Julian E. Butterworth, Cornell University, of **The Modern Rural School,** an authoritative text on rural educational administration, organization, and teaching in the United States.

Among his other interests are the problems of small high schools, agricultural economics, rural sociology, statistics, and school finance, especially in Federal aid for education. More recently he has given considerable attention to school and community relationships, to the professional organization of rural school administrators and teachers, and particularly to the development of the intermediate administrative unit.

In behalf of the American Country Life Association, this citation is conferred upon Howard A. Dawson, Director of Rural Service, National Education Association, for more than four decades of pioneering leadership in bringing to bear upon the problems of rural life and education the resources of the teaching profession; for a distinguished and unique contribution at national, state, and local levels to the solution of problems of school organization and finance; for persistently reminding his co-workers of our responsibility to provide adequate educational opportunities for all, according to their potential; and for unstinting service to many organizations and agencies concerned with the well-being of rural people and their communities.

ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING

The annual meeting of the American Country Life Association, Inc., was called to order by President Lois M. Clark, National 4-H Club Center, Washington, D.C., July 12, 1960, 4:10 P.M.

IT WAS VOTED to accept as read the minutes of the previous meeting.

The Secretary reviewed activities of his office — correspondence relating to membership, to mailing of the proceedings, and to the 1960 conference.

IT WAS VOTED to accept as presented the Treasurer's report. (See Exhibit A.)

President Clark led a discussion on the Treasurer's report, calling attention to the small balance on hand after the current expenses would be paid. She explained that for the last two years the ACLA had not received a grant from the Sears Roebuck Foundation, and that it would be necessary to find additional funds before the proceedings for 1960 could be printed. Any suggestions would be most welcome.

President Clark reported on the cross section of organizations and agencies at the annual meeting. She stated that there were 24 different groups represented.

In the absence of Dr. A. F. Wileden, Liaison Representative, the Secretary read a report prepared by Mr. Wileden on the ACLA agreement with the International Cooperation Administration. The report was accepted as presented. (See Exhibit B.)

Mis Clark reported that she had had a telephone conversation with the ICA office and there was no indication that the agreement would be discontinued.

Mr. Milo Swanton reported on the status of the Second Commission on Country Life. He stated that the ACLA still has an active interest in the appointment of such a Commission; however, it was felt that we should not actively push for the appointment of a Commission until the new Congress meets in January, 1961.

He reported that Mr. Bailey Guard, aide to Senator John Cooper, had met with the Board of Directors and discussed the bill written by Senator Cooper, calling for a Second Commission on Country Life.

President Clark reported that a bill had been introduced into and passed by the Senate for the establishment of a Commission on the Problems of Small Towns. This bill was introduced by Senator Karl Mundt.

The Secretary was asked to write a letter of appreciation to the National 4-H Club Center for the use of the facilities and for the hospitality extended, and to Mr. Robert D. McMillen, Public Relations Manager, Corn Industries Research Foundation, Inc., who did news releases on the Conference.

Appreciation was expressed to Dr. Mueller and Miss Irma Herrboldt for the work done by them.

Mr. Milo Swanton, chairman, recommended the following persons for a

three-year membership on the Board of Directors: to succeed themselves — Joseph Ackerman, E. W. Aiton, Arthur Floyd, Edward F. Holter, Ivan E. Parett, Maurice Soults, J. K. Stern; as new members — Rev. Serge Hummon and Miss Gertrude Humphreys.

Since there were no further nominations, the Secretary was asked to cast a unanimous ballot.

Special messages of greetings were extended to the Association from Mr. Ivan Parett, Dr. Paul Miller, Mr. Elmaar Bakken, Dr. A. F. Wileden.

President Clark stated that no invitation had been received for next year's meeting place.

President Clark asked the members to send to the Secretary's office the names of individuals and organizations that should be included in the mailings — both for invitation to join and to attend the annual Conference.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted:
E. W. Mueller,
Secretary

(EXHIBIT A)

AMERICAN COUNTRY LIFE ASSOCIATION, INC.

Treasurer's Report

January 1, 1959 through December 31, 1959

Balance on hand, January 1, 1959			$3,141.09
Receipts:			
Memberships — 135 ind., 1959 @ $2 ..$	270.00		
2 ind., 1959 @ $5 ..	10.00		
13 org., 1959 @ $25	325.00		
2 ind., 1960 @ $2 ..	4.00		
1 ind., 1960-64 — @ $2, ICA	10.00		
2 ind., 1960-66 — @ $2, ICA	30.00	$ 649.00	
Sale of proceedings		127.72	
Annual Meeting — 78 reg. @ $2 .....$	156.00		
59 banquet	162.25		
42 barbecue	73.50		
lodging	252.00		
meals	132.60	776.35	1,553.07
TOTAL RECEIPTS			$4,694.16
Expenditures:			
Multilithing and printing		$ 254.52	
Proceedings printed, 1958, 1,000		1,052.00	
Proceedings printed, 1959, 1,000		824.00	

Supplies		$ 102.10	
Postage		222.00	
R.C. Buck expenses		246.99	
Secretarial help		450.84	
Telephone		53.89	
Miscellaneous		12.59	
Annual Meeting — banquets	$ 178.75		
barbecue	104.27		
meals	134.40		
lodging	252.00		
entertainment	35.00		
Lackey expenses	82.76	787.18	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES			$4,006.11
Balance 12/31/59			688.05
			$4,694.16

AMERICAN COUNTRY LIFE ASSOCIATION, INC.
Treasurer's Report
January 1, 1960 through June 30, 1960

Balance on hand, January 1, 1960			$ 688.05
Receipts:			
Membership — 114 ind., 1960 @ $2	$ 228.00		
1 ind., 1960 — 63 @ $2	8.00		
3 ind., 1960 @ $5	15.00		
1 ind., 1960 @ $25	25.00		
12 org., 1960 @ $25	300.00	$ 576.00	
Sale of proceedings		128.82	
Miscellaneous		.20	705.02
TOTAL RECEIPTS			$1,393.07
Expenditures:			
Supplies (env., cards, etc.)		$ 43.24	
Postage		100.00	
R.C. Buck expenses		91.00	
Refund on proceedings purchased		1.24	
Flyer (5,000)		90.00	
Invitations printed		62.00	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES			$ 387.48
Balance 6/30/60			1,005.59
			$1,393.07

Outstanding bills, totaling $373.34.

(EXHIBIT B)

REPORT OF ACLA AGREEMENT WITH ICA
July 11, 1960

In 1956 the American Country Life Association worked out an agreement with the International Cooperation Administration whereby foreign nationals would be admitted into ACLA membership. This agreement, signed on June 25, 1957, for a period of three years, and expanded on May 19, 1958, is an arrangement whereby ICA would share in the payment of membership dues for foreign nationals under the ICA program. ACLA would provide membership privileges, literature, encouragement and limited assistance in developing a similar association in other parts of the world.

During the first year of operation, terminating July 14, 1958, nine foreign nationals were recommended to us for membership and four of these applied and were officially admitted to membership and four of these applied and were officially admitted to membership. A total of $39 in membership dues were received and turned over to our Treasurer. (See 1958 ACLA Proceedings.)

The following year, terminating July 14, 1959, five additional foreign nationals were recommended to us for membership. Two of these applied and were officially admitted into membership in the Association. A total of $33 in membership dues were received and turned over to our Treasurer. (See 1959 ACLA Proceedings.)

This past year, six more foreign nationals have been recommended by ICA to us for membership:

Garth A. Southwell Old Fort St. George Grenada, West Indies	Y. S. Patil c/o G. Drinker, Program Specialist USDA — TAS-FTD, Washington 25, D.C.
Anil K. Bose Young Farmers Association West Bengal Raibhoven, Calcutta I, India	Brij Raj Gupta Consulate General of India New India House, 3 East 64th Street New York 21, New York
Ram Singh Chaudhry Panch Shell Marg Ashok Nagar Jaipur (Ragasthan State) India	Jesus Gonzales Green c/o Earl B. Terwilliger USDA, Foreign Agriculture Service, FTD Washington 25, D.C.

In response to our formal letter of invitation, four of these referees have applied for and been admitted to membership in ACLA. They are: Garth A. Southwell, 7½ years; Anil K. Bose, 7½ years; Brij Raj Gupta, 1 year; Ram Singh Chaudhry, 5 years.

Jesus Gonzales Green has not yet had time to submit application. A total of $42 in membership dues has been received this past year and turned over to our Treasurer.

This agreement, although very modest in scope, has continued to work out very well. Presumably the three year arrangements will be now expiring, but this question has not been raised by ICA. It appears to your liaison representatives that this arrangement has the promise of good working relationships with foreign countries, and should the question be raised, it is his recommendation that it be continued.

A. F. Wileden,
Liaison Representative for ACLA

BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

The Board of Directors met on July 11 and 12, National 4-H Center, Washington, D.C. The meeting was called to order by Miss Lois M. Clark, president.

The following persons answered roll call: Joseph Ackerman, E. W. Aiton, Roy C. Buck, Lois M. Clark, Arthur Floyd, Robert T. Frerichs, Edward F. Holter, Paul C. Johnson, E. W. Mueller, J. K. Stern, Milo K. Swanton, Merle Thomas, W. J. Tudor.

IT WAS VOTED to dispense with the reading of the minutes of the previous meeting.

The Secretary reviewed activities of his office — correspondence carried on in the interest of memberships, the proceedings, and the 1960 conference. He gave a comparison of the present number of members with previous years.

The Treasurer reviewed the report prepared for the annual meeting. IT WAS VOTED to accept the report and to submit it as read to the annual meeting.

IT WAS VOTED to pay outstanding bills, totaling $374.34.

President Clark reported that she and Dr. Roy Buck had attended the White House Conference on Children and Youth as representatives of the ACLA.

She read an invitation from the National Conference on Citizenship, inviting the ACLA to send a delegate. The Board suggested that we decline the invitation.

President Clark reported that she had written to the Sears Roebuck Foundation about future support for the ACLA. She was informed that the Foundation was not in a position to make a grant this year, but they suggested that we make a request for 1961.

She stated that she had also written to the Kellogg Foundation, requesting a grant, but was informed that due to heavy commitments they could not at this time consider expanding the scope of their interests.

The President asked for suggestions to increase our balance in the treasury.

Miss Clark suggested that the constitution be restudied to see that we are following it. For example, it calls for an Executive Committee which we do not have.

She also expressed a hope that a policy on granting of citations might be developed.

Mr. Bailey Guard, aide to Senator John Cooper, joined the Board of Directors and discussed a bill written by Senator Cooper, calling for a Second Commission on Country Life. The Board discussed the bill. There was a feeling that it would be desirable to have a Commission larger than the seven-man board as suggested by the bill. The Board expressed hope that the Commission might consist of 11 to 15 members, that members would be on the Commission because of basic ability and fundamental interests and not because of their identification with a particular group, that it would be wise to keep in mind diverse personal backgrounds so that the Commission will reflect the thinking of many agencies and institutions who have a concern for country life.

The Board made no firm decision as to the time of introduction of the bill into Congress. Questions were raised as to the advisibility of introducing the bill during the remainder of the present session of Congress. ACLA members are urged to contact members of Congress about the bill. Mr. Edward F. Holter was asked to be the ACLA contact man in Washington.

President Clark reported on a bill introduced into the Senate by Senator Karl Mundt to study the problems of small towns. Dr. Tudor who inquired as to the status of the bill reported that it had passed the Senate before it recessed, with a few changes, and that a similar bill had been introduced into the house. He reported that it did not seem likely that the two bills could be combined. Mr. Holter was asked to keep in touch with this.

In the absence of Dr. A. F. Wileden, the Secretary reported to the Board that Mr. Wileden had submitted a report on the ICA agreement to be read at the annual meeting.

The Nominating Committee recommended the re-election of the 1959-60 officers. IT WAS SO VOTED: Lois M. Clark, president; J. Carroll Bottum, vice president; E. W. Mueller, secretary-treasurer.

It was decided that since there are not sufficient funds in the treasury the printing of the 1960 proceedings would need to be postponed until funds are available.

IT WAS VOTED to appoint a committee of three to make a progress report on the granting of citations and this committee is to report at the November Board meeting. President Clark appointed Roy Buck, chairman; E. W. Aiton and Merle Thomas as members.

IT WAS VOTED to appoint a committee to review our functioning as an organization, to study our constitution, and to make suggestions to bring the two in line; and to recommend a plan of rotating the Board of Directors. President Clark asked Dr. Mueller to assist her in this.

President Clark asked the following to serve on the Program Committee for 1961: J. Carroll Bottum, chairman; Rev. Serge Hummon, Paul C. Johnson, J. K. Stern and E. W. Mueller, ex-officio.

The next Board meeting was set for November 28, 1960, Farm Foundation, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, 10:00 A.M.

IT WAS VOTED to hold next year's meeting at the National 4-H Club Center, Washington, D.C., July 11 and 12, with a Board meeting the evening of July 10.

It was suggested that the Program Committee have its first meeting to plan next year's program prior to the November Board meeting.

It was further suggested that each Board member send suggestions for next year's program to the Program Committee chairman, J. Carroll Bottum, or to E. W. Mueller.

The President urged the Board members to write individual letters to persons who might be interested in membership in the ACLA and especially to those who might be interested in attending the annual conference.

IT WAS VOTED that the meeting adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,
E. W. Mueller, Secretary

The Board of Directors of the American Country Life Association met on November 30, 1959, 327 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois, 10:00 A.M. to 4:00 P.M. The meeting was called to order by President Lois M. Clark. The following persons answered roll call:

Lois M. Clark, J. Carroll Bottum, E. W. Aiton, Rev. R. T. Frerichs, Paul C. Johnson, Ivan E. Parett, Maurice Soults, J. K. Stern, Milo K. Swanton, W. J. Tudor, A. F. Wileden. In the absence of the Secretary, E. W. Mueller, Irma Herrboldt served as his representative.

The following members were absent: E. W. Mueller, Joseph Ackerman, Elmaar Bakken, Roy C. Buck, Lippert S. Ellis, Arthur Floyd, Aubrey D. Gates, Edward F. Holter, S. Janice Kee, Rev. D. W. Medearis, Mrs. Haven Smith, Merle Thomas, Rev. Irwin Will.

President Clark received communications from those not present. It was noted that Dr. Ellis is on an assignment in Ankara, Turkey, for a two-year period.

The minutes of the July 12 and 14 meeting were read. IT WAS VOTED to adopt the minutes as read.

Miss Herrboldt reported that the membership for 1959 included 146 individuals and 13 organizations. Six of these individuals are members through the International Cooperation Administration.

Miss Herrboldt reported on the action in distributing the 1959 proceedings. She indicated that they had been mailed to all members of the Association. Furthermore, in accordance with the decision made at the July Board meeting, a list of farm economists had been secured from Mr. Aylesworth

and she was ready to mail proceedings to these persons. The cover letter to go with the mailing was discussed. IT WAS AGREED that Mr. Bottum would advise Miss Herrboldt in the phrasing of this letter.

In compliance with the decision to notify the land-grant college libraries that the proceedings are available, IT WAS AGREED that a special letter should be developed. Mr. Soults agreed to compose this letter.

Miss Herrboldt reported that to date photographs have been received from twelve of the eighteen persons to whom citations have been given by the Association.

The Treasurer's report as prepared for the Board meeting was reviewed.

The President called attention to the fact that in the year 1959 payment was made for the printing of the proceedings for both 1958 and 1959. She also called attention to the fact that no payment had been received in 1959 from the Sears Roebuck Foundation.

Dr. Wileden explained that the ACLA has two contracts with the International Cooperation Administration. The first contract was made when the rate for dues was $5 per year and the second contract was made on the $2 per year basis. However, payments for persons joining under the ICA are being made according to the first contract. Mr. Wileden suggested that we accept this payment and extend the membership to such persons according to the amount of money paid.

On motion by Mr. Tudor, seconded by Mr. Soults, IT WAS VOTED to accept the Treasurer's report as presented.

The President presented the unpaid bills. She asked for action on these bills in the amounts of: National Lutheran Council for multilithing, July 1 to November 15, 1959 — $59.52; National Lutheran Council for supplies, July 1 to November 30, 1959 — $6.31; Miss Irma Herrboldt for secretarial services, July 1 to November 30, 1959 — $181.21.

On motion by Mr. Tudor, seconded by Mr. Parett, IT WAS VOTED to pay the bills.

Mr. Parett told the Board of his discussion with Mr. Mullen of the Sears Roebuck Foundation, relative to their customary grant of $1500 to the ACLA. Miss Clark read a letter from Mr. Mullen, acknowledging the request for continued support from Sears Roebuck Foundation and informing the ACLA that he would present the request to his Board in mid-December.

The President read to the group a letter received from Dr. A. B. Graham, telling of his recent illness.

On motion of Mr. Stern, and duly seconded, IT WAS VOTED that in view of his unusual services to country life an honorary life membership to the American Country Life Association be granted to Dr. A. B. Graham.

President Clark reported that the dates of July 11 - 13, 1960, for the annual meeting at the 4-H Club Center, Chevy Chase, Maryland, have been confirmed.

The President reported on developments related to the establishment of a Second Commission on Country Life.

On September 24 she had conferred with Congressman Thompson of Texas. The substance of the conversation was reported in a letter to Secretary Mueller on September 25, with a carbon copy to former President Roy Buck. Dr. Buck had indicated that these impressions were in accordance with his own.

The President further reported that on October 2 she had received a call from Helen Johnson of the Public Health Service, inquiring whether there was any relationship between the bill to establish the country life commission and a bill introduced in the Senate on August 31 by Senator Mundt to provide for the establishment of a "Commission on Problems of Small Towns" (S.2621).

In the discussion that followed there was general agreement with Mr. Buck's statement: "The problem, as I see it, is and has been one of concretely spelling out the need for a commission. This will be necessary for in a general sense it is difficult to point up any over-all sense of distress in agriculture or rural life. It is true that agriculture and rural life is changing, but this will not be sufficient. We need to see if we can make a case for the fact that the change is resulting in significant negative outcomes which would give the Commission idea an element of urgency."

Consensus was that there is need for continued effort to clarify the issues which make the need of a second Commission on Country Life urgent. IT WAS SUGGESTED that this might be good program material for an annual meeting.

The President also reported conversation with Secretary Mueller on the morning of October 21 when he had just returned from the meeting of the Committee on Management, Department of Town and Country Church, National Council of Churches of Christ. He had reported to this group the discussion of the ACLA Board of Directors at Carbondale in which we indicated the desirability of support being developed on a broader base than through the ACLA alone. In response the Committee on Management, NCCCA, had adopted a resolution which was to be transmitted to the ACLA and in which they indicate their readiness to take the initiative in convening representatives of the various groups which have shown interest, to consider what action should be taken in promoting the idea of an appointment of a Second Commission on Country Life.

IT WAS AGREED that the Association would continue to work in support of the Commission in accordance with the viewpoint and policy previously adopted with detailed action to be determined as matters developed.

The President reported that communications had been received in the interim since the July meeting, inviting the Association to become a member

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of the Council of National Organization of the White House Conference on Children and Youth. She had applied for this in the name of the Association and later had been informed that the ACLA is entitled to two delegates to the Conference, to be held in Washington, D.C., March 27 – April 2, 1960. Since these needed to be named prior to November 20, she had submitted her own name as one of the representatives and, inasmuch as Secretary Mueller could not be available for the conference because of other commitments, she had asked Roy Buck, as immediate past president, if he would be willing to serve.

A third communication had come from Dr. Hurst Anderson, chairman of the financial committee for the Council of National Organization, asking the Association whether it could make a contribution.

The President asked for action to confirm or disapprove the actions taken to date.

On motion by Mr. Swanton, seconded by Mr. Bottum, IT WAS VOTED that the ACLA be a member of the Council of National Organizations of the White House Conference on Children and Youth and that we authorize two delegates to attend – one of the delegates to be the President, Miss Clark, and the other to be Mr. Buck.

As a preparation for a consideration of plans for the 1960 meeting, the President asked for an evaluation of the Carbondale meeting and any implication this experience might have for the future.

A letter from Dr. Delyte Morris, president of Southern Illinois University, was read.

Mr. Parett reported that in his efforts to promote attendance by Illinois people he had found great difficulty in having it understood that ACLA is not a government agency. Mr. Tudor mentioned that many people thought it to be a life insurance group.

In discussing how a more accurate and helpful image of the Association could be developed, two areas were explored:

1. The information to be carried by the flyer now being developed;
2. The publicity or public relations aspects of the annual meeting.

It was felt that we have not done a good enough job of playing up personalities and making concerns of the Association come alive to people who are potentially interested but do not get to the annual meeting.

IT WAS AGREED that effort should be made to give the greatest possible emphasis to helpful publicity and promotion in developing plans for the 1960 conference.

In anticipating the 1960 conference, the question was raised by Mr. Swanton as to what methods had been used to secure large attendance at

annual meetings, as for example in 1930, when the meeting was held at Madison, Wisconsin, and attracted approximately 2,000 people.

IT WAS AGREED that this could be accounted for in part by the fact that: (a) the ACLA then had a full-time secretary and assistants; (b) many related groups were scheduled to meet in connection with the ACLA conference; (c) this was prior to the development of the numerous special agencies and other groups which now demand the time and attention of leaders.

The committee responsible for developing the flyer, showing the aims and unique contributions of ACLA, was asked to report. Mr. Wileden, chairman, expressed regret that Mr. Johnson had to leave for another appointment inasmuch as it was felt he could be particularly helpful in rephrasing the section on objectives. Some time was spent in noting some necessary changes for the sake of accuracy and in suggesting modifications or expansion on the section of objectives. IT WAS AGREED that Mr. Wileden should prepare a new draft on the basis of the suggestions given and then forward this material to Mr. Johnson for further refinement.

IT WAS AGREED that the format of the leaflet will be important to its effectiveness. It was hoped that Mr. Johnson would give attention to this also.

IT WAS PROPOSED that the leaflet be made available in printed form at an early date in order that it can be used for general promotion.

The President asked Mr. Bottum, as vice president and chairman of the program committee, to state the steps as he sees them in developing the program:

1. What are the ideas that should be the subject of the conference program;
2. What are the groups who should bring their viewpoints to bear on the subject;
3. How do you bring the contributions of these organizations to bear on the subject in the program?

General discussion followed of subjects to be considered for the program. Preliminary discussion centered in the question of values — how they are being influenced by our changing economy and the need to discriminate between the values which country people should hold on to and the ones on which we can give way.

There was general agreement with a concern expressed by Mr. Bottum that much is being done by special organizations and agencies to clarify economic issues but that other values in country life are not receiving needed attention. It was felt that this is the area in which the ACLA has major responsibility.

Miss Clark suggested that a worthwhile program could be developed around the topic, "Educational Forces and Resources in Rural America". Inasmuch as this is a time when new learning is needed by all our citizens it

seems important to take a look at what the various organizations and agencies in addition to the public schools are doing to educate and re-educate their clientele, and to consider the effectiveness of this in equipping citizens to function adequately in present day society.

Mr. Frerichs indicated that this would be a topic to which the various church organizations could relate themselves helpfully.

Mr. Tudor called attention to the possibility of relating the program somewhat to the White House Conference on Children and Youth by focusing on what we are doing to give youth the values we need.

The possibility of considering the farm family system in rural America and what can be done through the various institutions to maintain or strengthen it was mentioned.

Mr. Parett suggested that whatever topic is selected it would be valuable to have in it the elements of a farm family — mother, father, son, daughter. Mr. Wileden reported that he had seen this done very effectively at a national health conference.

Another proposal was that the problem of values might be effectively approached by some such topic as, "Country Life in 1970". This would involve the identifying of definable trends and give opportunity to consider the values involved and how we may protect or modify these values.

This idea in general seemed to be most acceptable. (The possibility that it might be called the Rural Family in 1970 was suggested, but not formally adopted.)

In general the program as envisioned would take this form:

Tuesday, July 12 —

Presentations in the following areas:	(Suggestions from
The Farm (technological and economic developments)	Bottum
The Community	Niederfrank
The School	Clark
The Church	NCCCA

for presenters.)

Each presentation would involve a paper developed in advance by the ablest possible person who would answer the question, "Where will we be in 1970?"

The **Tuesday evening** session would involve farm family members, possibly two men and two women, who would talk in terms of their own plans and hopes for the decade ahead.

Wednesday, July 13 —

The second day would be devoted to discussion groups with opportunity to bring the thinking of the groups back into general session.

Two major areas of concern would be explored:

1. What are the values so important to us that we must plan definitely to hold to them?

2. How can we organize or marshall our forces to hold the line and further develop desired values?

Leaders of the discussion groups would be carefully selected persons who have had access in advance to the four papers presented on Tuesday so that the value issues can be identified.

The **final session** would be the dinner meeting and might well be addressed by a person who could review the whole question of values, where we got them, how they change, etc.

The President indicated that she would ask Mr. Aiton, Mr. Stern and other members of the Board in the Washington area to serve with her as a committee to work out arrangements for involving area leaders in assisting in the conference and in developing publicity and public relations details.

She named to the Program Committee to work with Mr. Bottum as chairman, Mr. Frerichs, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Parett, Mr. Wileden. The President will be an ex-officio member. It was proposed that the committee meet in Chicago area at an early date which the president is to clear.

IT WAS SUGGESTED that better planning could be done for the annual meeting if planning would begin earlier. Therefore, IT WAS SUGGESTED that preliminary discussion of ideas for the 1961 conference take place at the meeting of the Board on July 11, 1960, and that a preliminary draft of the program be ready for discussion at the Winter Board meeting.

On motion by Mr. Wileden, seconded by Mr. Tudor, IT WAS VOTED that we commit ourselves to a serious consideration of values at next year's meeting.

Reference was made to the agenda item requesting a proposal for an objective study of ACLA. This was based on a memo from Mr. Aiton, July 1959, reporting a conversation between himself and Mr. Stern, and further related to concerns expressed by Mr. Buck following the Board meeting in December, 1958, with reactions by Mr. Swanton. Inasmuch as Mr. Buck was not present and Mr. Swanton had to leave the meeting early, discussion of this was tabled.

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Lois M. Clark
Irma Herrboldt

MEMBERS OF THE
AMERICAN COUNTRY LIFE ASSOCIATION, INC.
1960

Individual memberships:

Adix, Rev. H. M.
The American Lutheran Church
Portland 20, Oregon

Aiton, E. W.
Federal Extension Service
Washington 25, D.C.

Albrecht, Richard
Wallace Farmer
Des Moines 5, Iowa

Allen, Rev. H. T., Jr.
Presbyterian Church
Renick, W. Va.

Allison, Rev. W. Francis
Protestant Episcopal Church
Parkville, Mo.

Aull, George H.
Clemson College
Clemson, S.C.

Aylesworth, Phillip F.
Federal Extension Service
Washington 25, D.C.

Baker, Harold R.
University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon, Sask., Can.

Bakken, Elmaar H.
Boy Scouts of America
New Brunswick, N.J.

Baldwin, Robert D.
West Virginia University
Morgantown, W. Va.

Bangham, Edith
University of Wisconsin
Madison 6, Wis.

Bertrand, Alvin L.
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge 3, La.

Bliss R. K.
Belmond, Iowa

Bock, Rev. E. Wilbur
United Lutheran Church
Ames, Iowa

Bonser, Howard J.
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pa.

Bose, Anil Numar
ICA, Young Farmer's Assn.
Calcutta, India

Bottum, J. Carroll
Purdue University
West Lafayette, Ind.

Boyd, Virlyn A.
Clemson College
Clemson, S.C.

Brown, Philip
Farmers Home Administration
Washington 25, D.C.

Bryan, Mrs. Kendall
Girl Scouts of America
New York 22, N.Y.

Buchanan, George W.
Vocational Agriculture Teacher
Frankfort, Ky.

Buck, Roy C.
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pa.

Individual memberships:

Butt, Rev. E. Dargan
Seabury Theological Seminary
Evanston, Ill.

Byrn, Darcie
Extension Service Analyst
Washington 25, D.C.

Carnes, Otis G.
Pembroke State College
Pembroke, N.C.

Carr, Rev. James M.
Presbyterian Church, USA
Atlanta, Ga.

Cassidy, Rev. Hugh P.
Roman Catholic Church
Franklin, Ill.

Chaudhry, Ram Siagh
ICA
Jaipur, India

Christenson, Arthur
The American Lutheran Church
Minneapolis 15, Minn.

Clark, Lois M.
National Education Association
Washington 6, D.C.

Comfort, Rev. R. O.
Presbyterian Church
New York 27, N.Y.

Cook, H. Wallace
Elkton, Md.

Cowden, Mrs. Howard A.
Cowdena Farm
Primble, Mo.

Davidson, Rev. Wm.
Protestant Episcopal Church
New York 10, N.Y.

Douthit, J. B.
Clemson College
Clemson, S.C.

Ellis, Lippert S.
International Cooperation Adm.
APO, New York, N.Y.

Floyd, Arthur
Tuskegee Institute
Tuskegee, Ala.

Foster, William A., Jr.
Oregon State College
Corvallis, Oreg.

Fox, Glenn S.
Consumers Cooperative Assn.
Kansas City 16, Mo.

Franseth, Jane
Office of Education
Washington 25, D.C.

Frerichs, Rev. R. T.
American Baptist Assembly
Green Lake, Wis.

Golby, James L.
Vocational Agriculture Teacher
Kewanne, Ill.

Grant, Mrs. T. J.
Girl Scouts of America
Orlando, Fla.

Green, Jesus Gonzalez
ICA
Sevilla, Spain

Guard, Samuel R.
Breeder's Gazette
Louisville 6, Ky.

Gupta, Brij Raj
Consulate General of India
New York 21, N.Y.

Individual memberships:

Hanna, Rev. C. M.
Louisville Presbyterian Seminary
Louisville 2, Ky.

Hanna, Mrs. Sam
Homemaker
Renick, W. Va.

Hassinger, Edward
University of Missouri
Columbia, Mo.

Hays, Mrs. Earl
Home Demonstration Council
Falling Waters, W. Va.

Heflebower, Mrs. Garland, Jr.
Home Demonstration Council
Rippon, W. Va.

Heider, Anthony
Oceanside, N.Y.

Hendon, Robert L.
Murray State College
Murray, Ky.

Herrboldt, Irma
National Lutheran Council
Chicago 4, Ill.

Hess, Walter L.
USOM/Iran
APO, New York

Hobson, Mrs. Jane
Montpelier, Vt.

Hoiberg, Otto G.
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebr.

Holter, Edward F.
The National Grange
Washington 6, D.C.

Hostetler, John A.
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta, Can.

Humphreys, Gertrude
West Virginia University
Morgantown, W. Va.

Ittyachan, Cheruvathoor T.
ICA
Kerala State, India

Jehlik, Paul J.
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Washington 25, D.C.

Johnson, Kenneth E.
Consumers Cooperative Association
Kansas City 16, Mo.

Johnson, Paul C.
Prairie Farmer
Chicago 7, Ill.

Jones, L. I.
Federal Extension Service
Washington 25, D.C.

Kaitschuk, Rev. Arnold H.
United Lutheran Church
Campbell Hill, Ill.

Kaufman, Harold F.
Mississippi State University
State College, Miss.

Kee, S. Janice
Wisconsin Free Library Commission
Madison, Wis.

Keepper, W. E.
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Ill.

Kennedy, Virgil
Farmer
Brookfield, Mo.

Individual memberships:

Kennedy, Virgil D.
University of Idaho
Boise, Ida.

Kirkpatrick, E. L.
Marietta College
Marietta, Ohio

Kleckner, Clarence W.
The Grange
Rockford, Ill.

Knutson, Mrs. K. D.
Homemaker
Janesville, Wis.

Knutson, K. D.
Farmer
Janesville, Wis.

LeBeau, Oscar
Farmer Cooperative Service
Washington 25, D.C.

Lee, Won Sik
Agricultural Extension Service
Chun Chun City, Korea

Lindstrom, D. E.
College of Agriculture
Jabalpur, M. P., India

Locke, Frank M.
Trinity University
San Antonio, Tex.

Lutz, Rev. Wm. B.
Methodist Church
Fowlerville, Mich.

Magnuson, Osgood
Lutheran Student Foundation
Minneapolis, Minn.

Manny, Mrs. Elsie S.
Social Scientist
Washington 11, D.C.

Matthew, Rev. John C.
United Presbyterian Church
North Platte, Nebr.

Maurer, Rev. B. B.
United Lutheran Church
Harrisburg, Pa.

McBride, Rev. C. R.
Central Baptist Theol. Seminary
Kansas City 2, Kans.

McComb, Allan W.
The Grange
Mayville, Tenn.

Medearis, Rev. Dale W.
Disciples of Christ
Indianapolis, Ind.

Meisner, Joseph
National Catholic Rural Life Conf.
Des Moines 12, Iowa

Miller, Paul A.
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Mich.

Miller, Ralph E.
University of Minnesota
St. Paul 1, Minn.

Miller, Roy D.
United Theological Seminary
Dayton 16, Ohio

Mosher, M. L.
University of Illinois
Urbana, Ill.

Mueller, Rev. E. W.
National Lutheran Council
Chicago 4, Ill.

Murray, Rev. C. P.
Lawrenceburg, Tenn.

Individual memberships:

Neal, Mrs. Karl
Arkansas Library Commission
Little Rock, Ark.

Nell, Rev. George
Roman Catholic Church
Teutopolis, Ill.

Nelson, Emmie
National 4-H Service Committee
Chicago 5, Ill.

Nemori, Kenichi
ICA
Sapporo City, Japan

Niederfrank, E. J.
Federal Extension Service
Washington 25, D.C.

Norris, Ralph C.
Supt. of Schools
Des Moines, Iowa

Notowerdojo, R. Moertedjo
ICA
Indonesia, Malang

Parett, Ivan E.
Illinois Agricultural Assn.
Chicago 11, Ill.

Pepper, Rev. Clayton A.
American Baptist Assembly
Granville, Ohio

Porter, Ward F.
Federal Extension Service
Washington 25, D.C.

Puhr, Marie
Farm Credit Administration
Washington, D.C.

Quadland, H. P.
Public Relations
New York 17, N.Y.

Randolph, Rev. H. S.
Presbyterian Church
New York 27, N.Y.

Rapking, Rev. A. H.
Lost Creek, W. Va.

Rehkopf, Rev. Charles F.
Protestant Episcopal Church
St. Louis 3, Mo.

Rezende, Rubens De Moura
ICA
Washington 25, D.C.

Robinson, Wm. McKinley
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Mich.

Roop, Wendell
Sewell, N.J.

Rosenfeld, Louise M.
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

Russell, Cornelia
Methodist Church
New York 27, N.Y.

Samuelson, Rev. C. L.
Protestant Episcopal Church
New York 10, N.Y.

Sanford, Rev. Glenn F.
Methodist Church
Philadelphia 3, Pa.

Sardo, Joseph
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, Colo.

Sauer, Howard M.
South Dakota State College
Brookings, S. Dak.

Individual memberships:

Schler, Daniel J.
University of Missouri
Columbia, Mo.

Schnucker, Rev. Calvin
University of Dubuque
Dubuque, Iowa

Schroeder, Rev. Martin
United Lutheran Church
Lincoln 2, Nebr.

Schweitzer, Harvey J.
Farmer
Malta, Ill.

Senior, Clarence
Sociologist-Consultant
New York 27, N.Y.

Shen, Tai-kooh
Taiwan Fisheries Bureau
Taipei, Taiwan, Formosa

Sheppard, Frank W.
Texas State College
College Station, Tex.

Sizer, Leonard M.
West Virginia University
Morgantown, W. Va.

Skinner, Rev. Stanley E.
Cornell University
Ithaca, N.Y.

Smith, Rev. Richard K.
Presbyterian Church
New York 27, N.Y.

Soults, Maurice
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

Southwell, Garth A.
ICA
St. Georges, Grenada, West Indies

Stelling, Rev. W. J.
Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod
Freistatt, Mo.

Stern, J. K.
American Institute of Cooperation
Washington 6, D.C.

Stewart, M. C.
Farmer
Homer City, Pa.

Sutton, Elizabeth
Tallahassee, Fla.

Swanton, Milo K.
Wis. Council of Agriculture Co-op.
Madison 3, Wis.

Taylor, Calvin C.
U.S. Study Commission
Decatur, Ga.

Taylor, Carl C.
Research
Arlington 7, Va.

Taylor, G. W.
Extension Service
Tuskegee Institute, Ala.

Thomas, Merle J.
The Kroger Co.
Cincinnati, Ohio

Tompkins, Leo L.
Farmer
Waldorf, Md.

Torgerson, A.O.
Civil Engineer
Detroit Lakes, Minn.

Tudor, W. J.
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Ill.

Individual memberships:

Watson, Jake
Assessor-Collector
Beckville, Tex.

Whitaker, E. B.
Arkansas RR Corp.
Little Rock, Ark.

Wieting, C. Maurice
Ohio Farm Bureau
Columbus 16, Ohio

Wilcox, Robert W.
University of Idaho
Boise, Ida.

Wilson, A. F.
University of Wisconsin
Madison 6, Wis.

Willard, Rev. Leo
Baptist Church
Beckville, Tex.

Wolters, Rev. Gilbert
St. Benedict's College
Atchison, Kan.

Yohe, Ralph S.
Wisconsin Agriculturist
Racine, Wis.

Organizational memberships:

American Farm Bureau Federation
Chicago 54, Ill.

Boy Scouts of America
New Brunswick, N. J.

Council on Rural Health
American Medical Association
Chicago 10, Ill.

Farm Foundation
Chicago 5, Ill.

Grocery Manufacturers of America
New York 17, N.Y.

National Catholic Rural Life Conf.
Des Moines 12, Iowa

Dept. of Town and Country Church
National Council of Churches
New York 27, N.Y.

Division of Town and Country Work
Protestant Episcopal Church
New York 10, N.Y.

National Town-Country Church Institute
Protestant Episcopal Church
Parkville, Mo.

Church in Town and Country
National Lutheran Council
Chicago 4, Ill.

Dept. of Rural Education
National Education Association
Washington 6, D.C.

Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperative
Madison 3, Wis.